ELLIS'S
BINDER,
(13)
ER PLACE

Study 98

#14893
£20.00
1827.
HW Burn
£25.00
edn.

A

GRAMMAR

OF THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE,

COMPRISED IN A

SERIES OF LECTURES;

COMPILED FROM THE BEST AUTHORITIES,

AND

AUGMENTED WITH MUCH ORIGINAL MATTER,

DRAWN PRINCIPALLY

From Oriental Sources:

DESIGNED

FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS IN THE UNIVERSITIES.

DEDICATED, BY PERMISSION,

TO THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

BY THE REV. S. LEE, A.M.

D.D. OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE, HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF PARIS,
HONORARY ASSOCIATE AND F. R. S. L. AND M. R. A. S. &c.
AND PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JAMES DUNCAN, 37, PATERNOSTER ROW;
T. STEVENSON, CAMBRIDGE; J. PARKER, OXFORD; BELL & BRADFUTE,
EDINBURGH; AND M. OGLE, GLASGOW.

1827.

Macintosh, Printer,
20, Great New Street, London.

TO THE

RIGHT REV. JOHN, LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

THIS ENDEAVOUR

TO INVESTIGATE THE PRINCIPLES

OF THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE,

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY HIS LORDSHIP'S

MOST OBEDIENT, OBLIGED,

HUMBLE SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

IT will very naturally be expected, that, upon presenting another Grammar of the Hebrew Language to the Public, some reasons should be assigned for so doing; especially when so many have already made their appearance. This expectation I shall now endeavour to satisfy by stating, in what respects this Work differs from others:—which is perhaps the best reason that can be offered for its publication.

In the first place, then, as the Hebrew Language is seldom taught in schools, and is, perhaps, still less frequently studied to any extent till the Learner is arrived at the age of maturity, it has occurred to me, that those Grammars which exhibit nothing more than a *synthetical* detail of the rules common to this language, however well executed, are not calculated either to interest or inform that class of readers for which they are chiefly designed. It has been my object, therefore, to join the *analytical* with the *synthetical* method of treating this question: endeavouring at once to lay down the rules necessary to be taught, and to ascertain the principles upon which they are founded. How far I have succeeded, it will be for others to judge. That I have been right in the principle, I think all must allow who consider, how much more readily rules are comprehended, and how much

longer they are retained in the memory when rightly understood. Many proofs of human infirmity will, no doubt, appear in the manner in which this principle has been applied; and, on this score, I must crave the Reader's indulgence. I think I may venture to affirm, however, that I have, in some respects, advanced the subjects here discussed; and if so, like my predecessors, who have probably done much more, I must be content in my turn to give place to future adventurers in the same career who shall be still more fortunate.

But, to be more particular as to what has been done in the Work before us, it is necessary now to state, what the views taken in these Lectures are, and upon what principles they are grounded.

The Rabbinical system of vowels and accents, then, has been adopted, as that which is the most likely to promote a sound and accurate knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures: not, indeed, with a view of ascribing to it any thing like a Divine origin or authority; but, because it seems certain, that, among the various human systems hitherto proposed for the purpose of assisting the Learner, this is incomparably the best. Every one knows, that since the times of Elias Levita, various have been the efforts to abridge the labour of acquiring the Hebrew Language. Some have reduced the Grammar to one sheet or page, and the Lexicon to but little more, persuading their readers, that, as the Hebrew is the most ancient, so is it the most simple, of all languages; and, that men cannot look with too much suspicion on those attempts to make it complex and difficult, which were first set up by the Rabbins, and afterwards adopted by their equally blind advocates the Gramma-

rians who have followed them. But, if we allow that this Language is the most ancient and simple, still the question will remain, as to what this abbreviating and plausible system has hitherto done. Has it, it may be asked, supplied us with principles on which we can rely: or, by diffusing an overpowering light over the Sacred Text, been sufficient to bear down all opposition, or even to satisfy one candid enquirer, that he is a jot wiser on these subjects than his pious forefathers were? In most instances, I think, it must be granted, that our light has gradually become less—that the scope of the context has appeared less obvious, while the liability to mistake has been increased in an amazing degree. In others, the discovery and exhibition of amusing and splendid theories, has perhaps tended more to bring both religion and philosophy into disrepute, than any thing else could possibly do.

Hence it probably is, that the study of the original Scriptures has, for the last century or more, been daily on the wane in this country; and, that our knowledge of Divinity has not made that progress, which might otherwise have been reasonably expected it would. Intelligent and prudent men, perplexed and disgusted, perhaps, with the unmeaning disputes of the partizans of the several systems, have deemed it safer to adhere to that, upon which they could reasonably and conscientiously rely, than to embarrass themselves with theories, which promised every thing in words, while in matter of fact, they had really nothing to give.

But, on the other hand, although the Rabbinical system is infinitely superior to those proposed by Masclef, Hutchinson, and others; yet, it must be confessed, that this also has its defects: not to insist upon the consideration, that

it appears to be advanced but little farther than a state of infancy. The Michlol of David Kimchi, which is by far the most elaborate work hitherto produced by the Rabbins, is little more than a statement of what is found to take place in the etymology of the Hebrew Language. Of Principles nothing is said: and, on the Syntax, neither rule nor principle is so much as mentioned. On the laws which regulate the use of the tenses of the verb, nothing is any where to be found, either in his, or other Rabbinical, Grammars. If we turn to the Thesaurus Grammaticus of the elder Buxtorf, we shall find a Syntax supplied, presenting a very valuable collection of curious and interesting facts: but, even in this, we must not ask for reasons. The venerable Grammarian has laid down his rules with the hand of a master; but, when we find a great number of instances put under the head of "enallage," and referable to no rule, we cannot but suspect that there is a lack of knowledge somewhere; and may, perhaps, be led to suspect, that our views have in no case been rightly directed.

In some respects, indeed, I think the Grammar of Buxtorf is inferior to that of Kimchi. The Jewish Grammarian has given us a good classification of the different forms of the nouns; and has spoken more intelligibly than Buxtorf has on the system of syllabication. The consequence is, the Learner is left by Buxtorf to make out for himself two of the most difficult questions in the Hebrew Grammar, viz. the law which regulates the changes of the vowels, and that to which the different forms of nouns are subject.

Hence, the great desideratum appeared to be, the construction of Grammars which should at once combine the labours of the Rabbins, with a system of *analysis* deli-

neating the principles upon which the Language is founded, in such a manner as to inform the judgment, and to interest the understanding—to detail the rules, indeed, but, at the same time, to ascertain the principles upon which they are founded, so as to satisfy the scruples, and to ensure the confidence, of the Learner.

Towards arriving at this point, Alting* seems to be the first who did any thing considerable. After him Albert Schultens,† Schrœder,‡ and Storr,§ have perhaps been the most successful writers. Dr. Gesenius, the present Professor of Hebrew at Halle, certainly ranks next; though it may be doubted, whether his elaborate work, entitled, "Ausfurliches grammatisch-Kritisches Lehrgebaüde der Hebraischen Sprache," &c.‖ is not much more valuable for the facts which it presents, than for a scientific investigation of the principles of the Hebrew Language; in other words, whether he has not bestowed less pains than some of his predecessors on the *analytical* part of the Grammar; while, with the Rabbins, he has laboured more intensely in amplifying and adorning the *synthetical* one.

Dr. Gesenius is closely followed by Professor Stewart, of Andover¶ in America, in the very excellent Hebrew

---

* In a work which has often appeared under the title "Jacobi Altingi fundamenta punctationis Linguæ Sanctæ, &c.

† Institutiones ad Fundamenta Linguæ Hebrææ.

‡ Institutiones ad Fundamenta Linguæ Hebrææ, which has often been reprinted.

§ "D. Gottlob Christiani Storr Observationes ad analogiam et Syntaxin Hebraicam pertinentes." Tubingæ, 1805.

‖ Leipsig, 1817. Upon all of these, and some others, I have drawn largely in the work before us.

¶ Printed at Andover, for the second time, in 1823.

Grammar which he has published, but which is much shorter than that of the learned German Professor.

In the work before us, it has been my endeavour, rather to investigate the principles, than to give rules relating to the etymology and Syntax of this language. It has forcibly struck me, that what is most wanted by the Learner is, to be enabled to see upon what principles the Language is generally constructed: how, for example, the syllables are formed—words are derived, augmented, or combined; and how this affects the general force of sentences, when formed for the several purposes of speech: and further, by what notions, the people using this language, have been governed in communicating their ideas to each other. The rules given, I have deemed sufficient for the objects I had before me: believing, that very few examples can occur not referable to one or other of them. I may be excused, perhaps, for having paid so little regard to the system of Grammar adopted by the Greeks and Latins, the cases, &c. of which have been so frequently appealed to by other Grammarians. My reasons have been these: Those languages differ most widely in their character and idioms from this; and hence it has come to pass, that our Grammarians have occasionally had recourse to rules, which, in cases innumerable, they have been compelled to abandon; and then to have recourse to what has been termed the "enallage generis, temporis, personarum," &c. My object has chiefly been, to elicit from the obvious etymology of the Language itself, and the modes of thinking adopted by those Oriental nations which now speak dialects of the same Language, the principles and practices found to prevail in the Hebrew.

But to be still more particular. With respect to the composition of syllables found to prevail in the pointed system, I have ventured to propose rules, which the Rabbins recognize, and, with which every one becomes insensibly acquainted before he is moderately skilled in the Hebrew Language: although, I think, no Grammarian has hitherto distinctly stated them. Dr. Gesenius, indeed, and Mr. Stewart, have given us rules on the subject of *pure* and *impure* syllables: but, these rules, to be properly understood, involve so much of the etymology of the Language, that they can be but of little use to the Learner, while they are extremely perplexing to the more advanced Student. The system here proposed reduces the syllables all to one standard, and to one *apparent* measure: and which, it is remarkable enough, is never violated throughout the whole process of the etymology; a circumstance which simplifies, in a very great degree, the laws by which the variations of the vowels are regulated. What influence the accents formerly had in giving length to the syllables in which they are found, it is impossible to say: but, as far as I can see, they need not now be considered as exercising any such influence. It is true, they interfere occasionally with the vowels, in a manner not easy to be accounted for; but, generally, when considered either in their *Tonic, Euphonic, Distinctive,* or *Connective* characters, we can ascertain their force and use, as far, perhaps, as the nature of their authority would suggest as necessary.

My next endeavour has been, to investigate and lay down those laws, whereby certain consonants are generally rejected in the process of the etymology, as well as those, by which the vowels are likewise changed or contracted during the same process. In this, I think, I

have been successful in some degree, so that the Student is now enabled to reduce all the defective and quiescent verbs, as they have been termed, to the paradigm of the simple triliteral one of the measure פָּקַד; and also to account for the defective forms of nouns, at which he could formerly arrive only by conjecture. In the next place, I deemed it a more natural and intelligible process, first to consider the various forms of the nouns, and thence to derive the leading words for the several species of the conjugation of the verb, than to begin with the verbs, and thence to derive the nouns, as it has usually been done. My reasons were these: it appeared to me to be taking too much for granted, to talk of the conjugations of verbs, without endeavouring to ascertain what these conjugations were. Besides, allowing this to be the true method, still numerous forms of nouns remained unaccounted for: a circumstance which has induced some of the Grammarians to multiply the conjugations almost indefinitely. But, after all, what is a verb in the state of conjugation? According to the best Grammarians it is, in Hebrew, evidently a compound—a word of some sort combined with a pronoun, intended apparently to give it the distinction of person, &c. without which it could not be termed a verb. And, if this be the case, it must, before such composition take place, be a *noun* of one kind or other: and, the fact is, such nouns are, for the most part, found in the Language. On this view of the question, it occurred to me, that all the leading words taken in the different species of the conjugation, could be nothing more than nouns of one form or other; and, consequently, that before we entered on the consideration of the verbs, we ought to investigate the character of their component parts. I accordingly commenced with the nouns, beginning with the most simple, and ending with

the highest compounded forms; shewing, as I went on, and as far as it seemed necessary, what vowels should be considered as *mutable* or *immutable;* and hence, how the several forms might vary by being put in the plural number, the state of construction, or, when receiving the affixed pronouns, &c. &c. offering at the same time some conjectural etymologies, in order to account for the form and variation of meaning, which such words are generally allowed to bear. How I may please my etymological readers in this last article, it is impossible for me to say; nor am I very anxious on the subject. On a question so delicate as this is, opinions will necessarily vary. I can only say, my principal object has been, to impress these forms, with their peculiar shades of meaning, on the mind of the Learner: if any one can offer a better solution of them than I have given, he will deserve the thanks of the Public: and, he may rest assured, he shall have mine. That the augmented nouns are compound forms, however, I shall be disposed to maintain, until it be shewn, what indeed has often been erroneously taken for granted, that this Language acknowledges no compound forms.

Another reason, why I have been disposed to take this view of the question before us is, that it enables us at once to account for the apparently indefinite number of conjugations laid down by Schultens and Schrœder, by supposing, that it has occasionally been found necessary to take a compound noun in conjunction with a pronoun, in order to enounce some action or event in the form of a verb, which no other word would satisfactorily do. And another, the fact, that there occurs but a very few unusual forms of verbs, not to be found also existing in the form of the noun thus taken for their leading word or theme. Again, the variations of the vowels, in what are

termed verbs, are universally subject to the same laws with those which take place in the nouns, and for the same reasons. Hence, I have been induced to believe, that words assume the functions of verbs only, when combined with one or other of the pronouns; and, that this distinction seems to have been made for the purpose of pointing out the several persons necessary for the purposes of speech. As to the Infinitives and Participles, as they have been called (and I have not thought it absolutely necessary to abandon these terms), they are, according to my view, nothing more than abstract or concrete nouns, respectively, involving neither tense nor person, but to be qualified, in these respects, by the context in which they are found.

In connection with this subject, perhaps, I may notice what is offered in this Work, on the use of the tenses of the verb. It occurred to me, that, if the form usually taken for the leading word of the preterite tense of verbs, is really a concrete noun, while that which forms the present, or, as it has hitherto been termed, the future, is an abstract, some reason perhaps might be discovered, why these forms have been selected: and if so, we may also discover the laws, by which this usage was originally regulated. The consequence has been, the results arrived at and laid down in the Syntax on this subject; to which, I must confess, I have the vanity to ascribe some importance, especially, as I find the Arabian and other Oriental Grammarians, fully agreeing in the principle, and reasoning precisely in the same manner on the practice found to prevail in the sister dialects. What influence this may have on the signification of some passages in the Scriptures which have hitherto seemed obscure, particularly in the declarations of prophecy, it is no difficult

matter to imagine. And, here, I cannot help saying, that since I first arrived at these results, I have not only been most diligent in endeavouring to discover, whether any passages could be found, not admitting of an easy and natural solution by their application, which I have not yet done; but also, that I have seen a consistency and harmony in the whole to which I was before a stranger; and consequently, a clearness and vigour, particularly in the poetical and prophetical Books, of which I had before no conception.*

The work of Koolhaas on this subject, it has not been in my power to procure; but, from what I have seen recorded of it by Dathe,† as also from his Dissertationes Philologico-exegeticæ, &c. Amsterdam, 1751, which I possess, I have reason to believe, that in some things he was nearly right; in others, not so. The work of Mr. Gell‡ I have read with care; and must say, that, while it evinces considerable acuteness and research, it does not appear to me to have advanced the subject beyond the theorem of Schrœder (Synt. R. 49.), on which it really proceeds; and, not only to have left a great number of cases unaccounted for, but also to have accounted for others too metaphysically to make it probable, that any such principles could ever have regulated the language of real life. The Tracts published at York in 1809 and 1810 on the same subject, I have also examined: but these, according to my notions, exhibit a greater degree of failure than the work of Mr. Gell.

---

* Of this, it is my intention, as soon as possible, to offer some proofs in a new translation of the whole, or a considerable part of the Psalms, with notes, &c.

† Philologia Sacra Glassii, Ed. Dathe, p. 296, &c.

‡ Observations on the idiom of the Hebrew Language, Lond. 1821.

In the Syntax, I have endeavoured to ascertain the nature of the several cases, and, to confirm my views, by the usage of the Arabian Grammarians. In the Latin and Greek, and indeed in our own, Grammars, we have been accustomed to consider almost every thing with reference to the technical forms, genders, &c. of words, without paying much attention to their signification or logical character. The rhetoric, too, is generally reserved for other treatises, and hence, its figures have been seldom appealed to. The Oriental Grammarians, on the contrary, have found it absolutely necessary to call in these considerations to their aid: not, because it was their wish merely to adorn their Grammars with a vast display of erudition (with which they have been too often accused), but, because they have found it impossible to write satisfactorily on this subject without them: and, because they knew and felt that their common conversation is, in a great degree, regulated by them. That this should be the case, can appear surprising to none who will take the pains to consider, that man must have been in primitive times (and, that he still is in a great degree) the creature of nature, not of art:— that he would speak as he felt, unrestrained by refinements which are oftener the result of caprice than of sound reason, and would call in the objects around him to his assistance, personifying or otherwise modifying them, as the nature of his subjects should require. Influenced by these views, I have laid aside the distinctions of grammatical cases usually appealed to, and have treated words as complementary, restrictive, or the like, of the signification of others with which they are to be construed: and, as this method is equally applicable to every part of speech, it has appeared to me to simplify the subject. Taking this view of the subject, then, I think I can

affirm, that of all languages this is the most simple. The whole etymology is regulated by the combination or juxta-position of words or fragments of words, which can take place on not more than two principles; viz. 1. that of apposition; and, 2. that of definite construction. To this the whole of the Syntax is also reducible. The detail, is perhaps long; but this arises purely from the necessity of shewing the application of our principles in every sort of case.

To the Syntax I have appended a few pages on the distinctive use of the accents. My reasons for doing this I have there stated to be, a desire to lay before the Student a few rules on a subject, which is not without its importance and use. That it is necessary to cultivate the doctrine relating to the accents to much extent, I have no idea; and, therefore, I have given only just as much as will enable the Learner to comprehend the bearing of the accents, as generally spoken of in the Commentaries.

As I have occasionally cited the Arabic Grammarians, the question might be asked, To what extent the cultivation of this Language and of its sister Dialects should be carried, in order to enable the student to become well acquainted with the Hebrew? I answer, As the Hebrew Language has now ceased to be spoken in its purity upwards of two thousand years, and, as these dialects still retain a very considerable portion of its words, and are manifestly regulated by the same Grammatical laws, generally speaking, he who is the best acquainted with these dialects, is by far the most likely person to be a successful commentator on the Hebrew Scriptures. On the versions of the Septuagint and Vulgate, entire reliance cannot be

placed; and the same may be said of all the Oriental ones. To these versions, indeed, we are very greatly indebted on several accounts; there are, nevertheless, so many marks of human infirmity discoverable within them, that it is certainly incumbent on every one who is anxious to see the beauties and to feel the force of the Holy Scriptures in all their bearings, to add to these helps, others which Providence has placed within his power; and thus to further the progress, and to advance the clearness, of that light which alone can be said to shine to the perfect day.

In this point of view, therefore, we are greatly indebted to the Rabbins, who were the first to go to the Language of Ishmael for that assistance which circumstances had taken out of their own hands, and thence to transmit it to us. In the next place, the names of Pococke, Castell, De Dieu, Schultens, Schrœder, and others, will ever be revered by those who appreciate the Holy Scriptures. For, although, there are a few instances of failure in the etymologies, &c. of these great men; yet, they have left behind them enough to convince every candid mind, that there are in these dialects treasures innumerable, which have escaped their observation.

One source they have almost entirely neglected; namely, the laws to which the Grammars of these several dialects are subject: and this, it must be confessed, is one of the first importance. The notions of Grammar held by Europeans, are far removed from those which prevail in the East; and here, I think, has been our greatest defect. In the work before us, I have endeavoured in some degree to supply this: but, in the time I have had to do

so, it is quite impossible that the subject can have been exhausted. Here, then, as well as in the etymologies of words, we have an ample field for future labour; and one, perhaps, that cannot fail to produce an abundant harvest. It could be wished, in the mean time, that Government, or the East India Company, or both, would do something towards obtaining accurate editions of the native Arabic Lexicons, Grammars, Commentaries on Grammar, Scholia on the Poets, &c. with which our Libraries abound. That solitary individuals can undertake such works as these is quite impossible: and, till something of this kind be done, we must not expect to see the Grammar of the Hebrew Language carried far beyond a state of infancy. To expect fully to make out an Oriental book, such as the Bible is, without the assistance of Oriental learning, is, in my estimation, a perfect absurdity. Let the candid Reader generally examine the laborious and pious Commentaries now in use; and to which, it must be confessed, we owe much that will stand the test of the severest enquiry: yet, what must be his general conclusion? I think it must be, that in many cases he can find no light: in others, palpable darkness: and in many, nothing that professes to go beyond the force and extent of ingenious conjecture. It is true, no new doctrines are to be expected: those which are the most important, are to be found in the very worst translation. But, then, their clearness may have been obscured, and their force diminished. Difficulties, apparent discrepancies, and obscure passages, may yet remain, which it could not but be advantageous to the cause of Christianity should be removed. Besides, the general endeavour to translate the Scriptures for the use of Missionaries, makes it doubly binding, that we should endeavour to give nothing to the world, which is not, as nearly as human industry can make

it, the unadulterated Word of God. And, for these ends, I believe, we have sufficient helps within the compass of our command.

It now only remains to say, in what way this Work should be used with the greatest prospect of success to the Learner. It has long appeared to me, that the short Grammars with which our market abounds, have produced the most lamentable effects among Learners. They have professed to give in a few sheets, what those, whose fate it has been to study them, have never been able to find realised during their whole lives—a complete knowledge of this venerable tongue. While, on the other hand, many who might, in the end, have become good scholars, have been alarmed at the sight of a large Grammar to such a degree, as to give up every thing at once in despair.

It has been my endeavour to provide for both these cases. And with this view, I have printed the Work before us in two kinds of letter, a larger and a smaller. That in the larger, has been intended to occupy the place of a Primer, while the other in the smaller, may be reserved until the Student shall feel the want, and be able fully to enter into the merits, of it. For the mere beginner, however, a still further abridgment may be made, which I should advise to be this. Let him make himself tolerably well acquainted with the letters and syllables (passing over the accents), as taught in the two first Lectures. Then let him proceed on to Art. 154. in the sixth Lecture, examining the forms of nouns printed

---

* On this subject he may read the "Disputatio" prefixed to my "Sylloge Librorum Orientalium, Cantab. 1821.

in the larger letter, and copying them out, or making an abridged list for his own use; improving at the same time upon his teacher as far as he can; and, in short, doing any thing to raise a question in his mind, whereby these forms, &c. may be impressed upon his memory: but let him learn nothing by rote. To engage his understanding in the work, is by far the surest method; and, if he can succeed in doing this, he may depend upon it, his progress will be easy, delightful, and rapid. Let him come to the subject as he would to the study of a science, and he will find, that he will not only make a solid progress, but also a gradual improvement in his own reasoning powers.

When he is got to the end of the nouns, concluding with Art. 177., he had better proceed to the verbs, beginning with the tenth Lecture. Here he may carefully read over the preliminary observations, and then proceed to make out tables for himself, like those in the Grammar; but arranged and discussed in a manner as much superior as possible; omitting here, as before, the parts printed in the smaller letter. When he is got to the end of this subject, concluding with Art. 219. 10., he had better proceed to the general paradigm at pp. 268—281, endeavouring to account for the defects, &c. as they occur, referring constantly to the regular triliteral verb, in the left-hand column, as the standard. When some facility is acquired in this, the next step is, to get a copy of "Robertsoni Clavis Pentateuchi, &c., and daily to read a portion of the Hebrew Pentateuch with it, until he has acquired a copia verborum, and can see his way a little before him. When he has done this, he may daily read a small portion of the Syntax, and occasionally those parts of the etymology, which were at first past over, the necessity and use of which he will now begin to see. During this pro-

cess, he should be careful to trace every thing, as far as he can, to first principles; which he will be enabled to do, by following the references given in the several articles and paragraphs. In this way he should proceed, until he is familiar with the whole of the Grammar, studying, at the same time, some part of the Sacred text with a good translation and commentary.* To learn the Grammar by one continued effort, without an application to the text of Scripture, will be tedious and unprofitable. The rules will appear difficult to retain, the reasons on which they are founded obscure and uninteresting, and both will, therefore, soon be forgotten. On the other hand, the Text of Scripture, without recurring to the Grammar, will appear equally perplexing, dark, and indefinite: but, when both are wrought up together, the mind will gradually rise to the subject, so that scarcely an hour will pass, in which some new accession of knowledge will not be realised. In this stage, however, he will stand in need of constant advice to sobriety — to be jealous of the discoveries now made, and exceedingly sparing in making public the new lights he may have the good fortune to elicit. These, indeed, he may register for future inspection; and this would be an excellent plan: but, let him be content to wait for a maturity, which, he may rest assured, however calm his judgment or brilliant his talents may be, he will stand in need of.

I do not know that any thing now remains to be said, except to solicit the Reader's indulgence, for the time which has elapsed since this Work was announced. On

---

* For a list of books, see my "Sylloge."

this head, I will only say, that when I undertook it, I by no means truly estimated the quantity of labour which it would cost me: and that, circumstanced as I have been, it has never been in my power to give it my undivided attention for any length of time. I trust, however, this delay is in some degree atoned for, in the quantity of original matter with which it now appears; and which, I cannot but hope, will tend to advance the science of Hebrew Grammar among us, and with it, the knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures.

The Reader should be informed, that the Edition of the Hebrew Bible, from which the examples in this work have been taken, is that of London, 1822.* This is important to know, because there is occasionally a slight variety in the text of the several editions, as also in the divisions of chapters and verses.

---

* תורה נביאים וכתובים. Biblia Hebraica secundum ultimam editionem, &c.... ab Everardo van der Hooght, &c.—à Judah D'Allemand.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

On the Alphabet ..... 2—11
On the Vowels ..... 11—17
On the combination of the Vowels with the Consonants .... 17—19
On *Shĕvá* and its Substitutes ..... 19—22
On the points *Dāgésh* and *Mappík* ..... 22—23
On the mark *Rāphé* ..... 23—24
On the difference between *Kāméts* and *Kāméts Khātúph* .... 24—25

LECTURE II.

On the Hebrew Accents ..... 26—31
Praxis in Reading ..... 31—35

LECTURE III.

On the general principles which prevail in regulating the Etymology, with reference to the Consonants ..... 36—40
On the contractions, &c. of the Vowels ..... 40—41
On the changes of the Vowels ..... 41—44
On the use of *Shĕvá* and its Substitutes ..... 44—47
Rules for the insertion of *Dāgésh* ..... 47—50

LECTURE IV.

On the general use and situation of the Accents 51
On the Tonic Accent ..... ib.—53
Certain Anomalies as to the situation of do. ..... 53—59
On the use and situation of the Euphonic do. 59

Rules for the insertion of do. ..... 59—62
On the use and position of *Makkáph*..... 62
Rules for its insertion and use..... ib.—64

LECTURE V.

On the changes which take place in the terminations of words, in forming the Feminine from the Masculine Gender ... 65—69
On the changes in the inflections of Nouns 69
On forming the Dual Number..... ib.—70
On forming the Plural Number Masculine..... 70—73
On forming the Plural Number Feminine..... 73—75
On taking the form Proper for the Definite state of construction..... 75—77

LECTURE VI.

On the parts of speech in general, and on the Noun in particular..... 78—80
Of the Pronouns..... 80—81
Of the Personal do. separable..... 81—82
Of the Personal do. inseparable..... 82—87
Anomalies ..... 87—88
On the use, signification, and forms of words generally..... 88—98
On the first species of Segolate Nouns..... 98—100
On the second do. 100
On the third do..... ib.—101
On the fourth do..... 101—102
On the fifth do. ..... 102—104
On the forms of those Primitive Nouns which are not Segolate ..... 104—108

LECTURE VII.

On the augmented Hebrew Nouns..... 109—111
On the reduplicated do..... 111—115
On the reduplicated do. by implication ..... 115—116
On the augmented Nouns termed *Hēemantí*..... 116—117
On do. when the *Hēemantí* letters are prefixed 117
On do. when taken as leading words in the conjugations .. 118—124
On do. when used as Participles 124
On do. when used as leading words in the *Niphḥál* species of conjugation ..... 125—126

Examples of these several forms and classes.
Of the first 127
Of the second 128
Of the third 129
Of the fourth ..... 130—132
Of the fifth 132
Of the sixth ..... ib. — 134
Of the seventh ..... 134—135

LECTURE VIII.

On the *Hēemantí* letters postfixed to words 136
On the eighth class of such Nouns ending in י ..... ib. — 139
On the ninth class of do. ending in ם ..... 139—140
On the tenth class of do. ending in ן ..... 141—142
Of otherwise reduplicated Nouns ..... 142—147
On the forms and composition of Nouns adopted as proper names ..... 147—155

LECTURE IX.

On the separable particles ..... 156—160
On the inseparable do. ..... 160—164
On the particles termed *Paragogic* ..... 164—165
On א *Paragogic* 165
On ה do. ..... ib. — 168
On ו do. ..... 168—169
On י do. ..... 169—170
On ן do. ..... 170—173
On the Demonstrative Pronouns 173
On the Relative do. ..... 174—175
On the Interrogative do. ..... 175—176
On the Interrogative inseparable particle ה ..... 176—178
On the Interrogative particle אַי ..... 178—179
On the Definite Article ה ..... 179—183
On the numerals Cardinal and Ordinal ..... 183—188

LECTURE X.

On the Verbs ..... 189—197
Paradigm of the Preterite Tense of the first species *Kal*, first form 198

Second and third do..... 199—201
Notes on the persons of do..... 201—205
Paradigm of the Present Tense of the first species *Kal*, first form ..... 205—206
Of the second and third do. 207
Notes on do..... 208—210
Of the forms of the Infinitive of *Kal* ..... 210—212
Of the Imperative of do..... 212—213
On the Participles 214

LECTURE XI.

Paradigm of the conjugation of the second species *Niphḥál*. 215—216
Notes on the Tenses, &c. ..... 216—219
Paradigm of the conjugation of the third species *Pīḥél*.... 219—220
Paradigm of the Passive Voice ..... 220—221
Notes on the different Persons, &c. ..... 221—223
Paradigm of the conjugation of the fifth and sixth species, *Hiphḥíl* and *Hophḥál* ..... 223—225
Notes on do. ..... 225—228
Paradigm of the seventh species *Hithpāḥél* 229
Notes on do. ..... ib.—231
On the less usual species of the conjugation of Hebrew Verbs 231—233

LECTURE XII.

On the Defective Verbs 234
On those commencing with ב ..... ib.—236
On those commencing with א or י ..... 236—239
On the *Kal*, *Pīḥél*, *Pūḥál*, and *Hithpāḥél* species of Verbs commencing with י ..... 239—242
On the conjugation of Verbs having ו or י for their medial radical letter ..... 242—245
On the conjugation of such Verbs as have ה for their third radical letter ..... 245—249
On those which have א for their third radical ..... 250—251

LECTURE XIII.

On those Verbs which have their second and third radical letters the same ..... 252—255
On the doubly defective Verbs generally ..... 255—256

On the first class of such Verbs ..... 256—258
On the second and third classes of do. ..... 258—260
On the Inseparable Pronouns when attached to Verbs .... 260—261
Tables of do. ..... 261—262
Examples of do. ..... 262—263
Remarks on do. ..... 264—265
On the changes of the Vowels on account of do. ..... 265—267
On the changes of the Vowels in the Defective Verbs 267
General paradigm of the different kinds of Verbs conjugated in all the usual species..... 268—281

LECTURE XIV.

On the Syntax, the character of Propositions, &c..... 282—284
On the Predicate of Propositions ..... 284—286
Of the concordance of the Subject with the Predicate .... 286—290
Of the concordance of the Nominative with its Verb..... 290—296

LECTURE XV.

On the general dependence of words one upon another.... 297—299
Remarks on do. ..... 299—301
Of words in immediate apposition with one another ..... 301—304
On the Nouns of time and place..... 304—306
On the use of the Article..... 306—310
On the words to be construed as Adverbs ..... 310—313
On the repetition of words for the purpose of distribution, &c. 313—314
On the repetition of words for the sake of emphasis ..... 314—315
On Nouns put in the definite state of construction..... 315—316
On do. examples when *immediate* ..... 316—319
On do. examples when *mediate* ..... 319—320
On the distinctive state of construction ..... 320—321
Notes on certain idiomatical expressions..... 321—322
On the construction of the Numerals 322
On the concordance of do. with the thing numbered..... ib.—323
On the other modes of construction ..... 323—325

LECTURE XVI.

On the complements of words generally, and of verbs in particular ..... 326—328
Examples of Verbs and Verbal Nouns in *immediate* connection 328
Examples of *mediate* do..... 329
Examples of do. both *immediate* and *mediate* ..... ib.
Examples of do. when *mediate* and *various* ..... ib. —330
Observations on do..... 330—335
On apparently elliptical constructions, said to be "constructiones prægnantes" ..... 335—337
On do. of the Relative Pronoun אֲשֶׁר..... 337
On do. wherein some consequence is intimated by the constructio prægnans..... 338—340

LECTURE XVII.

On the Modes and Tenses of the Verbs..... 341—343
On the *absolute* use of the tenses ..... 343—346
On the *relative* use of do. ..... 346—348
On the relative use of do. in citations..... 348—351
On the Modes Subjunctive, Conditional, Imperative, &c. .. 351—352
On the Preterite when used as a Future Tense ..... 352—355
On do. when used as an Imperative..... 355—356
On do. when used as a Pluperfect ..... 356—357
On the Preterite in enouncing general opinions, hypothetical sentences, &c. ..... 357—360
Remarks on do. ..... 360—363

LECTURE XVIII.

On the nature and construction of the Particles..... 364
Do. of the Adverbs..... ib. —369
Do. of the Prepositions ..... 369—373

LECTURE XIX.

On the nature and use of the Conjunctions..... 374
Do. of אֲשֶׁר &c. used a Conjunction ..... ib. —378

Examples of Copulative do. ..... 379—380
Examples of Conditional do. 380
Examples of Causal and Conclusive do. ..... ib.
Of the Interjections ..... ib.—382

LECTURE XX.

On the composition of sentences as pointed out by the Accents 383
On the distinctive powers of the Tonic Accents ..... ib.—386
Table pointing out their order of Consecution, &c. ..... 387—393
On the Accentuation of the Metrical Books ..... 394—397

ERRATA.

Page	line	read
9	21	gutturals
24	30	93
—	31	115
25	2	112
38	4	אֱמֶת
39	1	גְּבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר
—	ib.	*Nĕvūkadnetstsár*
—	2	גְּבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר
—	ib.	*Nĕvūkadretstsár*
41	28	94
53	27	These ...take &c.
59	10	אַל
66	7	יְרוּשָׁלַיִם
—	33	inseparable
68	17	מַלְכָּה
71	19	is occasionally
83	18	יָהּ
—	35	following noun—
95	9	two or more—
96	23	מַלְכָּה
98	34	מְלָכִי
100	28	חֲלָקִים
101	21	פְּקֻד
102	13	קְשֹׁט
141	21	חָנָן
157	14	יהוה
160	36	180
161	23	*dele* as
171	17	אֶתְחָנָן
184	6	*Tables*
185	1	*dele* Masc.
186	4	חֲחַמִּשִּׁים
189	27	חָכָם
190	31	פָּקַד
203	25	תִּי
204	29	עֵשׂ
206	21	חַיָּה
209	9	אַהֲרָנָה
211	24	מְלָךְ
—	32	פְּקֻדִי
216	11	נִפְקָדָה
226	38	יִתְאַחַר
235	28	verbs commencing
247	18	נָשׂוּ
255	18	פּוֹדֵד
268	16	סְבִי
272	12	קַמַּלְנוּ
273	4	יְשֵׁב
282	29	قَائِم
291	15	الاشتمال
304	26	والزمان
316	26	حاتم—غلام
320	27	وجهٍ
334	7	seem
362	18	*him*)
373	33	is regulated
392	2	פְּגִיהֶם
393	6	חֲיָתָה
394	22	power
395	30	various, just

The Reader is requested to make these corrections; a few broken letters may also occur in some of the sheets, against which it was not possible to guard.

LECTURES

ON THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE.

LECTURE I.

ON THE ORTHOGRAPHY, SYLLABICATION, &c., OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

1. AS it is proposed to offer, in the present course of Lectures, a comprehensive and practical view of the structure of the Hebrew Language, all discussions relating to General Grammar, Philology, and Antiquities, will be avoided as much as possible; referring as we proceed to Authors who have treated on those subjects. It will also be taken for granted, that the Student is acquainted with Grammar, as generally taught; and, that he is penman sufficiently good to write down such forms of letters, &c. as shall be laid before him.

2. But, although it is desirable that the Learner should know something of the principles of Grammar as generally taught; yet, he must not hence be tempted to infer, that a system, almost entirely at variance with that to which he has been accustomed, is unphilosophical or wrong: or, because he cannot at first sight comprehend all its bearings, that it is, therefore, uncouth, embarrassed, or ambiguous. For, it may be true, that the Language of the Patriarchs and Prophets is as consistent in its structure, as the subjects on which it treats

are interesting and momentous: and, that it is as explicit and regular as other languages, which have been cultivated with greater ardour, while they had less to offer in return. He must, therefore, allow the Language, on which we are now entering, to stand or fall on its own merits; and, our delineation of it to be judged by the just rules of criticism. We mention this, in the outset, not to depreciate the labours of others who may have taken a different view of this subject; but, to warn the student, that the idioms of the Hebrew and other Dialects connected with it, are neither to be judged nor explained by those of European languages; and hence, to caution him against that trouble and confusion, into which some have had the misfortune to fall.

On the Alphabet.

3. The system of Orthography, found in our Hebrew Bibles, and that which has ever been taught with the greatest success,* presents a succession of consonants written in a direction proceeding from the right hand of the page towards the left. Two or more of these are found in every word: while the words themselves are separated from each other by a moderate space. To this system of consonants another is added consisting of vowels, which are placed above, in the middle, or below, the line of consonants, as their several natures may require. To this, again, is superadded another, consisting of Accents, which are also placed either above, in the middle, or below, the consonants, in the same line or rank with the vowels. Before the student can possibly read the Hebrew text, therefore, he must be made familiar with these several parts of Hebrew orthography.

4. We shall proceed, in the first place, to delineate and explain the characters of the consonants: the number, forms, names, powers, and numerical values, of which are as follows.

---

* We say, the greatest success: for, after all that has been said by the advocates of the unpointed text, it will be extremely difficult to point out one author of that school who has really advanced the knowledge of Hebrew Learning.

Number and Order.	FORMS. Biblical.	Samaritan.	Rabbinical.	NAMES.	POWERS.	Numerical Values.
1	א	𐤀	א	אלף Ălef	H unaspirated, as in *humble, hour*, &c.	I.
2	ב or בּ	𐤁	ב	בית Béth	V or B respectively, as in *van* or *ban*.	II.
3	ג or גּ	𐤂	ג	גימל Gĭmél	G hard, as in *gird, gain*.	III.
4	ד or דּ	𐤃	ד	דלת Dáleth	D, as in *do, dare*.	IV.
5	ה	𐤄	ה	הא He	H aspirated, as in *hard*.	V.
6	ו	𐤅	ו	וו Vaw, Vav, or Waw	V, by some, as in *vow*, by others, W, as in *work*.	VI.
7	ז	𐤆	ז	זין Záyin	Z, as in *zeal*, or S in *those*.	VII.
8	ח	𐤇	ח	חית Khéth	Kh strongly aspirated, as ch in the German, *nicht*.	VIII.
9	ט	𐤈	ט	טית Téth	T, as in *turn*.	IX.
10	י	𐤉	י	יוד Yód	Y, as in *yes, yonder*.	X.
11	כ or כּ and as a final ך	𐤊	כ and as a final ך	כף Cáph	C, as in *carry, cash*.	XX.
12	ל	𐤋	ל	למד Lámed	L, as in *love*, &c.	XXX.
13	מ and as a final ם	𐤌	מ and as a final ם	מם Mém	M, as in *man*, &c.	XL.
14	נ and as a final ן	𐤍	נ and as a final ן	נון Nún	N, as in *no*, &c.	L.
15	ס	𐤎	ס	סמך Sámech	S, as in *Sir*; never as S in *those*.	LX.
16	ע	𐤏	ע	עין Áyin	The true sound of this letter being unknown, it is usually passed over in silence, as H in *humble*: we shall designate it thus, H.	LXX.
17	פ or פּ and as a final ף	𐤐	פ ף	פה Pé	PH, when without the point, as in *Philip*; P, when pointed, as in *pint*.	LXXX.
18	צ and as a final ץ	𐤑	צ ץ	צדי Tsādé	TS, as in *mats*, &c.	XC.
19	ק	𐤒	ק	קוף Kóph	K, as in *look*, &c.	C.
20	ר	𐤓	ר	ריש Résh	R, as in *roast*, &c.	CC.
21	שׁ שׂ	𐤔	ש	שין Shín / שׂין Sín	SH, as in *shine*. / S, as in *son*, never as S in *those*.	CCC.
22	ת or תּ	𐤕	ת	תו Taw or Tav	TH or T respectively, as in *thin* or *tin*.	CCCC.

In this and all future examples where the Roman vowels will be put to represent the Hebrew ones, *á*, or *ā*, will have the sound of the Italian *a*, or *a* in *far*, and *a*, as *a* in *man*; *é*, or *ē*, as *a* in *wane* or *ai* in *rain*: *e*, the same sound shortened; *í*, or *ī*, as *ee* in *seen*; *i*, as *i* in *in*; *ó*, or *ō*, as *o* in *rose*: *o*, the same sound shortened; *ú*, or *ū*, as *oo* in *boot*: *u*, as *oo* in *good*. The first vowel in each case will represent the accented or emphatical syllable, e. g. *á* in *fáther*, &c; the second with the mark (-) as *ā*, *ē*, &c. will shew, that, as such vowel must terminate a syllable, it will be pronounced openly, but not with an accent.

5. The Samaritan and Rabbinical forms of the Hebrew character have been introduced for the following reasons:

1. The Samaritan Pentateuch, being nothing more than a different edition of that in use among the Jews, the Student will want no other help for reading it, than the forms of the Samaritan character: and,

2. As the Rabbinical commentaries are composed, for the most part, in Biblical Hebrew, he will stand in need of little more than a copy of their alphabet to enable him to read them.*

6. The *number* and *order* of the consonants, as given in the table, are found in the text of the Hebrew Bible. The following are the passages:—Psalms xxxiv. cxix. cxlv.; Proverbs xxxi., from verse 10 to the end; Lamentations i. ii. iii. iv. In Psalm xxxiv., however, the verse beginning with ו *Vav* has either been lost, or both ה *He* and ו *Vav* are found in the 6th verse; and in the cxlvth, that which should commence with נ is also wanting. In the ii. iii. and ivth chapters of the Lamentations, ע *Áyin* and פ *Pé* are found transposed, which perhaps may be attributed to the copyists.

7. As to the forms of the consonants, it is highly probable, that they were originally hieroglyphical:† but, whether the Hebrew or

---

* Should the learner wish to make considerable progress in Rabbinical learning, he will find some of the best books pointed out in Sect. xi. of my Sylloge Librorum Orientalium. Cantab. 1821.

† Champollion *Précis. du Syst.* Hier. pp. 312, 316. Plates A. to K.—P. Lacour. Essai sur lés Hier. Bourdeaux. 1821. pp. 45—48, 131, 166, &c. Though I can see no reason why we are to go to Egypt for the Hebrew Letters, unless we are to suppose that marks, representing certain substances, could not be formed elsewhere.—See Geshichte der Hebräische Sprache, &c. von Wil. Gesenius, §. 40—45.

Samaritan form is the most ancient, a difference of opinion seems to have prevailed as early as the times of Jerome; and which, as Schultens has justly remarked, has been contested in some instances with an acrimony, which neither the nature of the case, nor the love of truth, could justify:* some maintaining, that the Samaritan was the primitive form, and that Ezra adopted the other on the return from Babylon: others, that the Biblical character, as we now have it, is the same with that in which Moses composed his Autograph.† For my own part, I am inclined to believe with Baver‡ and some others, that which of the characters soever we take as exhibiting the most ancient form, the other is no greater a variation from it, than may be traced in our own black letter as derived from the Roman; and, by no means so great as that discernible between our own hand-writing, and the printed letter, from which it has been derived. The only question, then, that can arise must be, Which is the most ancient form? And this, I think, no one can determine in the absence of express historical information. Both might have existed together for ages, the one in Judea, the other in Babylonia, just as the black letter has prevailed in Germany, while the Roman has been preferred in this country. But, as this question involves nothing of importance to the learner, its further prosecution here will be unnecessary.§ The letters תרמלהא, when occurring at the end of a line, are sometimes lengthened out thus, תרמלהא, in order to fill up the space.

On the Powers of the Consonants.

8. א *Alef*, as already remarked, has the power of an unaspirated H: that is, it is used for the purpose of enouncing the vowel following it, without any audible aspiration. It appears probable also, that this was its power in ancient times; not only, because the same letter has to this day the same power in the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic, which are nothing more than dialects of the Hebrew; but, because we find it occasionally put for ה Hé, or ע Áyin, in the Hebrew Bible itself; and, in the cognate dialects, the Syriac and Chaldee, for י Yód.|| By the ancient

---

* Fundam. Ling. Heb. p. 18.

† See the controversy between Capell and Buxtorf.

‡ Crit. Sac. Baveri, Tract. i. §. 12. p. 125 (mihi).

§ Those who wish for further information on this subject may consult the Critica Sacra of Baver, Tract i. §. 10, where reference is made to the best writers on this question.

|| See the Hebräisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch by Gesenius, under the letter א.

Greeks and Latins it was expressed by one or other of the vowels unaspirated, and mostly by Alpha or A.* In writing Hebrew words in Roman letters, we shall form the syllable in which this letter is found by representing that vowel only which accompanies it.

9. ב *Béth* is found either with or without a point inscribed, as בּ or ב. In the first case it is pronounced as our B; in the second, as V; and hence, it is sometimes represented by ו *Vaw*, as גֵּבְ, sometimes written גֵּוְ. In the cognate dialects it is occasionally changed for פ *Pé* or מ *Mém*, being a letter of the same organ with them. But of this more will be said hereafter.

10. ג *Gīmél* is also found written with or without the point, thus גּ or ג. In the first case, all are agreed that it should be pronounced like G in the words *gird, give*, and the like. How it should be pronounced in the second, grammarians are not agreed. Some think it should take the sound of G in *ginger;* others, that it should be pronounced as G in the German *Ge*macht, &c. The usual practice, however, is, to sound it like G, in *gird*, in every case.†

11. ד *Dáleth* is also found both with, and without, this point, as דּ and ד. In the first case it is pronounced like D in *dare, do*, &c. In the second, some give it the sound of TH, in *thine, this;* others neglect this distinction, and pronounce it like D in every case. It is probable, that it was originally pronounced with the tip of the tongue placed against the roots of the fore-teeth, just as its corresponding letter is still pronounced by the Orientals; which will give it rather a softer sound than that of our D. It is also probable, that it had two sounds, as it is the case now with the Arabic, where we have د *Dál* and ذ *Dsál* or *Dhál*, the former pronounced like D dental, the other like *th* in *thine*. Hence we may account for דָּבָר *Dāvár* meaning *a word*, and דֶּבֶר *Déver*, meaning *a pestilence:* the root of the former being ذبر *Dhábara, scripsit librum*, &c., the other دبر *Dábara, ulceratum fuit*, &c. Hence we have ذبر *Dhábr* from the first root signifying *Scriptura*, and ذابر *Dhábir, bene discens, et edoctus, sapientiam*, as of similar import with דָּבָר *Dāvár*, a *word, relation*, &c. And from the

* See the Bibliotheca Sacra by Masch, partis secund. vol. ii. pref. p. 35, &c.: also, the Dissertatio R. P. Bernhardi de Montfaucon de veteri literarum et vocalium Hebraicarum pronunciatione, tom. ii. of his Hexapla of Origen, or in the Bibliotheca Hebræa of Wolfius, tom. ii. p. 648; or the Appendix to Jahn's Gramm. Ling. Heb. &c.

† The manner in which the ancients represented this, and other letters of the Alphabet, may be seen in Masch or Montfaucon, as cited above.

second دبر *Dábr*, *mors*, of similar import with דבר *Déver*, *pestis*, &c. This method of accounting for the powers of several other letters of the Alphabet, will satisfactorily explain the apparently conflicting significations sometimes found to prevail in the same Hebrew root, of which the modern Lexicographers have very properly availed themselves.*

12. It will be unnecessary to make any additional remarks on the following letters till we come to ח *Khĕth*; and, on this it is only necessary to say, that like ד *Dáleth*, it probably had two sounds originally, one more, the other less, aspirated, as may be seen in the Dictionaries.

13. ט *Téth* should be pronounced with the tip of the tongue against the roof of the mouth, and hence may be termed cerebral.

14. י *Yód* is equivalent to our Y, as given in the table. The Germans represent this letter by J, which they pronounce like our Y: and, as the first Hebrew Grammars studied in this country were imported from Germany, we adopted the word Jehovah, Jehu, &c., which they very properly pronounced *Yehovah*, *Yehu*, &c. When at the beginning of a word, and having the vowel *i*, it loses its consonantal power, and takes the sound of the vowel only, as *Is-ra-el*, not *Yis-ra-el*. This is also found to take place in the Arabic, as *Iktob*, not *Yektob*, for يَكْتُبُ.—See De Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 4, note.

15. The sound of כ, without a point, probably partook more of the sound of K than of ח *Khéth*, which will account for its being represented by the Greeks by χ and κ. With the point (כּ) it is universally sounded like our C in *carry*, as already given.

16. ס *Sāmek*, and שׂ *Sín*, have, for many centuries, been pronounced alike, i. e. like S, in *sin*; and, although many Hebrew words are now found written with either promiscuously, it is doubtful whether this be not owing to the copyists; or, possibly, to a departure from the pronunciation of שׁ *Shín*, which may have been peculiar to this form (ש) in ancient times. In Syriac, ܣ *Semchat* supplies the place of both ס *Sámek* and שׂ *Sín*, as does also س *Sín* in the Arabic.

17. ע *Áyin* probably had, like ד *Dáleth* and ח *Khéth*, two sounds originally; one approaching to that of *g* mixed with *r*; another to that of א *Álef*, just as it is the case with the Arabs who have both غ *Gain*, and ع *Ain*. The examples to be found in the modern Lexi-

---

* Eichhorn in his Edition of the Lexicon of Simonis, Schulz in his edition of Cocceius, and Gesenius in the Hebrew Dictionary already cited. See also Storr's Observationes ad Analogiam et Syntaxin Hebraicam, p. 48.

cons under this letter, as well as the various orthography of proper names found in the Septuagint, may be considered as sufficient proof of this position.* At present, this letter is usually passed over, like the Álef, in silence. The sound of *ng* in *king*, as given to it generally by the Jews, may probably have prevailed even in ancient times. I have observed in the pronunciation of the Arabs of Barbary, that they give a nasal sound to their Ain, ع; and that the Archbishop of Jerusalem, who was some time ago in this country, pronounced the Syriac ܥ in this way, although the Maronites inform us, that it should be pronounced with a sort of compression of the throat.† We shall designate it in the Roman characters by an H, with a point under it.

18. The sound of ק *Kóph* is something harder than that of כ *Cáph*: it is made by a sudden compression of the throat, and may be compared to the noise made by water when discharging itself from a bottle. The explanations given in the table will be sufficient for the remaining letters.

19. We now come to the numerical values of the letters. We have given in the Table (Art. 4) the letters corresponding to the units, tens, and hundreds up to 400. The remaining hundreds up to one thousand, are thus expressed: ך *Cáph* final is put for 500; ם *Mém* final for 600; ן *Nún* final for 700; ף *Pé* final 800; and ץ *Tsādé* final 900. One thousand is mostly expressed by the word אלף *Élef*, a thousand; two thousand by אלפים *Alpáyim;* and any number of thousands by using the word אלף *élef*, thousand, or אלפים *Ălāfím*, thousands, with the proper numeral prefixed, as the rules of Syntax shall require. Sometimes, as in the notes of the Masora, א stands for one thousand; but on this subject the Hebrew tables of abbreviations should be consulted.‡

20. The numbers from ten to twenty are made by

---

* See the Lexicons of Gesenius, (and Simonis, ed. Eichhorn,) under this letter. See also Storr as above, p. 48.

† Amira's Grammatica Syriaca, Rome, 1596, p. 6.

‡ Joannis Buxtorfii de Abbreviaturis Hebraicis Liber, with the Supplement of Wolfius. Biblioth. Heb. tom. ii. p. 575. For the abbreviations found in the Masora, see the Tiberias, or Commentarius Masorethicus, of Buxtorf.

adding such unit to the numeral for ten, as will make the number required. Thus יא will represent eleven, יב twelve, and so on. The number 15, however, is made by טו, i. e. 9+6, not יה, i. e. 10+5, because יה is one of the names of God. In like manner, 21 will be כא, 22 כב, לב 32, מב 42, and so on. On this principle, the number given at the end of Genesis for the verses found in that book is, אֶדֶלֶד = 1534.

21. Whether this method of expressing numbers formerly prevailed in the Hebrew manuscripts, has been a subject of some dispute, and which it is now impossible to determine. That the numbers have been expressed in words written at length for some centuries, there seems to be no doubt, but whether this was the case in very ancient times or not, it is difficult to say.*

22. As the Hebrew letters are sometimes changed for one another, both in the radical words, and in the process of derivation; and, as this change seldom takes place except in letters of the same organ,† the following classification of the letters according to the different organs of speech has been given:

1 Gutterals,	א *Álef*,	ה *Hé*,	ח *Khéth*,	ע *Áyin*.
2 Palatals,	ג *Gīmél*,	י *Yód*,	כ *Cáph*,	ק *Kóph*.
3 Linguals,	ד *Dáleth*,	ט *Téth*,	ת *Tav*.	
4 Sibilants,	ז *Záyin*,	ס *Sámek*,	צ *Tsādé*,	שׁ *Shín*, שׂ *Sín*.
5 Labials,	ב *Béth*,	ו *Vaw*,	מ *Mém*,	פ *Pé*.

The letters ל, מ, נ, ר, are termed liquids.

23. Whether any of the letters בגדכפת be with or without the points, as given in the table of the Alphabet, or whether others assume their own final forms, it makes no difference as to their classification, they still belong to one or other of the above classes.

24. Four of the letters of the Alphabet occasionally lose their consonantal powers, and are then said to be *quiescent* or *silent*. The letters are א *Álef*, ה *Hé*,

---

* See Baver's Critica Sacra, Tract i. §. 23, page (mihi) 188.

† As גו for גב, and גף *the back*; מריא and בריא *fat*; and many others to be found in the dictionaries.

ו *Vaw,* and י *Yód,* which form a sort of *memoria technica* in the word אדהוי *Ĕhĕví.* The letters above-mentioned, which occasionally have a point inscribed, have, for the same reason, been formed into the technical word בגדכפת *Bĕgadkĕpháth.* The final letters which are sometimes produced are exhibited in the words אהל תמר *Óhel Tāmár,* Tamar's tent: and the finals which vary in form, as mentioned in the table, are comprehended in the word כמנפץ *Camměnappéts, "Like a disperser."*

25. The letters have been further divided into two classes; one containing such letters as are occasionally *servile,* that is, are employed in the process of grammatical derivation; the other, those only which are never so employed; the first have been termed *servile,* the second, *radical* letters. The *servile* letters are, however, occasionally *radical,* though the *radical* ones are never *servile.*

26. The *servile* letters are all comprehended in the following *memoria technica,* viz. משה איתן וכלב, *Mōshé Ēthán Vĕcālév,* i. e. *Moses, Ethan,* and *Caleb.* The remaining letters are termed *radical.*

27. In almost all the printed copies of the Hebrew Bible, we find some of the letters occasionally larger or smaller than others; sometimes inverted, at others suspended a little above the general line of printing; and in one instance, we have a final letter in the middle of a word; in others, a medial letter is used as a final: out of all which the Jews, and indeed some Christian writers, have endeavoured to elicit certain mysteries. But as they are most likely all owing to some accident in the transcription of the MSS. we may be excused in dismissing them without further notice.*

28. The best method the learner can adopt for making himself acquainted with the letters is, to write them over carefully and frequently, till he is quite familiar with all their forms. In doing this, he should strongly

* The places may all be seen in the Grammar of Guarin, tom. i. p. 12.

mark the difference between those letters, which are in some respects similar, such as ב *Béth*, and כ *Cáph*, ג *Gīmél*, and נ *Nún*, and so on; in order to avoid the confusion which beginners often experience, and which is by far the most vexatious part of Hebrew studies; and to make that pleasant which is to many extremely irksome. If he use a pen, the point should be cut a little oblique, in order to make the horizontal strokes strong and regular; the others, which should be perpendicular, should be made fine and equal. An oriental reed, however, makes by far the best pen for writing these letters, which should be cut nearly like a pen, with a slit, and the point oblique, as already mentioned.*

On the Vowels.

29. It has already been remarked, (Art. 3.) that the Hebrew vowels present a system of marks or characters arranged sometimes above, at others in the middle, and at others beneath, the consonants: we now proceed to delineate and explain it.

Table of the Hebrew Vowels.

	Figure.		Name.	Power.	Exemplifications.		
Perfect Vowels.	ָ or ָה	קָמֵץ *Kāméts*	*ā* as	בָ *bā*,	גָ *gā*,	דָ *dā*, &c.
	ֵ	צֵרֵי *Tsēré*	*ē* —	בֵ *bē*,	גֵ *gē*,	דֵ *dē*, &c.
	ִי	חִירִיק גָּדוֹל *Khīrík Gādól*	*ī* —	בִי *bī*,	גִי *gī*,	דִי *dī*, &c.
	וֹ †	חוֹלֶם *Khōlém*	*ō* —	בוֹ *bō*,	גוֹ *gō*,	דוֹ *dō*, &c.
	וּ †	שׁוּרֶק *Shūrék*	*ū* —	בוּ *bū*,	גוּ *gū*,	דוּ *dū*, &c.

* These reeds may be purchased at Messrs. Kingsbury, Parbury, and Allen's, Booksellers in Leadenhall Street, London. The exact method of cutting and holding them may be seen in the Developpemens des Principes de la Langue Arabe Moderne, par Auguste F. I. Herbin.

† In these cases, the consonant ו is considered as the mere fulcrum of the accompanying vowels.

Figure.	Name.	Power.	Exemplifications.		
Imperfect Vowels.					
־	פַּתַח *Páthakh*	*a* —	בַּד *bad*,	גַּד *gad*,	דַּד *dad*.
ֶ	סֶגוֹל *Sēgól*	*e* —	בֶּד *bed*,	גֶּד *ged*,	דֶּד *ded*.
ִ	חִירִיק קָטוֹן *Khīrík Kātón*	*i* —	בִּד *bid*,	גִּד *gid*,	דִּד *did*.
ָ	קָמֶץ חָטוּף *Kāméts Khātúph*	*o* —	בָּד *bod*,	גָּד *god*.	דָּד *dod*.
ֻ	קִבּוּץ *Kibbúts*	*u* —	בֻּד *bud*,	גֻּד *gud*,	דֻּד *dud*.

Sheva, and its substitutes.

ְ	שְׁוָא *Shĕvá*	*ĕ* —	בְּרִי *bĕrī*,	גְּרִי *gĕrī*,	דְּרִי *dĕrī*.
־	חָטֵף פַּתַח *Khātéf Páthakh*	*ă* —	בַּרִי *bărī*,	גַּרִי *gărī*,	דַּרִי *dărī*.
ֱ	חָטֵף סֶגוֹל *Khātéf Sēgól*	*ĕ* —	בֱּהֵא *bĕhē*,	גֱּהֵא *gĕhē*,	דֱּהֵא *dĕhē*.
ֲ	חָטֵף קָמֶץ *Khātéf Kāméts*	*ŏ* —	בֳּהָא *bŏhā*,	גֳּהָא *gŏhā*,	דֳּהָא *dŏhā*.

30. It will be seen from the Exemplifications, which of the vowels-marks are placed above, which in the middle, and which below, the line. From the note appended to the table of consonants, will also be seen what sounds are given to the Roman vowels, as here made to represent the powers of the Hebrew ones; and, consequently, what powers the Hebrew vowels are to take.

31. The learner cannot now do better than make out a syllabarium for himself, extending throughout the whole of the alphabet, in the manner of the Exemplifications just given; bearing in mind, that whenever either of the letters contained in the *memoria technica*, בגדכפת *Bĕgadkĕpháth*, begins a syllable, the point should be inscribed. The exceptions will be given hereafter. He should also bear in mind, that the consonant must

---

* The sound of *ĕ* in these examples is remarkably short, better expressed by our *brī*, *grī*, *drī*, &c. without a vowel. So in the substitutes, which usually accompany the guttural letters. The final vowel יִ, &c. has been added, in order to facilitate this rapidity of utterance in *bărī*, *gărī*,—*bĕhē*, *bŏhā*, &c. making one syllable only.

always precede the vowel, as marked in the table: a few exceptions to this rule will be noticed hereafter.

32. The usual classification of the vowels has been, 1. Long vowels, 2. Short vowels, and 3. Vowels still shorter than the preceding. We have adopted a different one, for the following reason. These distinctions cease to exist when the vowels are combined with the consonants; for then, the second class of vowels becomes long, either by position; that is, when a consonant follows; or, by being accompanied with an accent. Both these classes of the vowels are, therefore, *long* when reduced to practice; and it is absurd to speak of them in any other point of view.

It can never be necessary, we believe, to trouble the learner with the *five* different lengths of time ascribed to these vowels by Albert Schultens and Schrœder; although the latter has declared, that it is a law *amplissimum usum habens*, because we have been unable to discover in what the use consists.*

33. By *perfect vowels*, as given in the first class, is meant, Vowels, which being preceded by a consonant, will constitute a *complete syllable*, as בָּ *bā*, in which, both the consonant and vowel are fully and properly enounced. The same is the case, when either of the letters contained in the *memoria technica*, אֶהָוִי *Ĕhĕví*, which occasionally lose their consonantal powers, (Art. 24,) follows its homogeneous vowel, (of which more hereafter,) as, בָּא *bā*.

34. By *imperfect* vowels is meant, those vowels which are not *generally* found to constitute syllables without either the addition of a following consonant, or of an accent. Such syllable, therefore, must be either like בַּד *bad*, or בָּ *bā*, i. e. followed by a consonant, or accompanied by an accent. When a consonant, moreover, is found to follow a *perfect vowel*, with an accent, as קוֹם, &c., the same may be said to be the case.

---

* Institutiones ad Fund. Ling. Heb. Art. xxviii.; and Schrœder's Grammar, Rule xxx.

35. The last class of signs has been designated "Substitutes for the mark (:) *Shĕvá,*" which, in truth, they are, as we shall see hereafter.

36. Our object in adopting this new nomenclature is, to avoid the inconsistency of detailing a system of *long*, *short*, and *most short vowels;* and then, informing the learner, that after all, every short vowel becomes long in practice; and, that the class of the *shortest vowels* contains nothing more than substitutes for what, in fact, are no vowels at all.

37. We now come to the figure or form of the vowels: and, in order to give the best account we can of them, we must be allowed to state what we believe to be their real history. Those who wish to see what has been said by Capell, Buxtorf, and others, on the antiquity, &c. of these vowel-points, had better have recourse to their writings,* or, if a mere outline will suffice, they will find one in the "Institutiones ad Fundamenta Linguæ Hebrææ," by Albert Schultens, from page 50 to 65. Greater abilities and learning were, perhaps, never displayed than in this controversy; nor indeed a greater degree of rancour. It was with great difficulty, that Capell got his book printed at all; and when it appeared, it was hailed by the Roman Catholics as a document of the greatest value, because, forsooth, it seemed to unsettle every thing connected with the study of the Holy Scriptures. The name of Capell, in consequence, became associated with all that seemed likely to undo the great work of the Reformation, and to bring into jeopardy many of the states of Europe. Among the Lutherans of Germany, the opinions of this elegant, but unfortunate writer, were considered as highly heterodox: so much so, that they gave rise to a new article, to be subscribed by all who were candidates for holy orders, which, as I have been informed, is still in force. Orthodoxy, or heterodoxy, in short, seemed to be comprised in the simple question, whether a man adopted, or rejected, the opinions of Capell. The son of this learned and great man, it should seem, took refuge at length in the Roman Catholic Church, in order, as it is said, to avoid the rancour of the Protestants, who were then but ill acquainted with the principles of toleration. This, however, has only been mentioned to show the great impropriety of such proceedings. Later times have

---

* Arcanum punctationis revelatum of Capellus, Lugd. Batav. 1624, and Buxtorfii Anticritica seu vindiciæ adversus Capellum. Basil 1653.

proved, that Protestantism lost nothing by the labours of Capell: but, on the contrary, can boast of one of the ablest scriptural critics, that the Christian Church has ever produced. But to proceed with our history of the vowel-points.

It is very well known, that the Syrians adopted the Hebrew Alphabet as early as the latter end of the first, or the beginning of the second, century; and that the Arabs adopted that of the Syrians, some time about the beginning of the seventh. The most ancient form of this alphabet, as found among the Syrians, has been termed the Estrangelo,* which corresponds in a remarkable degree with the oldest character in use among the Arabians, termed the Cúfic. Upon comparing the Syriac Estrangelo with the Hebrew, a coincidence in form, name, and power is immediately observed, sufficient to shew, that the one is an immediate copy of the other. The same may be said of the similarity observable between the Estrangelo Syriac and the Cúfic.

38. The Syrians appear to have borrowed, with the letter, a system of vowels which they retain to the present day: the Arabs also appear to have borrowed the same (though differing a little in form) from the Syrians. And from the Arabs this system has been carried into Persia, Turkey, India, Tartary, and the islands of the Malays.

39. In the ancient Estrangelo Syriac, then, a single round point, placed above any consonant, took the sound of *a* or *o*: beneath any consonant, the sound of *e* or *i*. With the letter Vau (Syriac ܘ) this point seems to have had the sound of *ū*, which it still retains, whether placed above, or below, that letter. It may, indeed, originally, have been placed in the middle of the line of consonants, in order to distinguish it from the other points used with Vaw as a consonant: and, of this, some proof is to be found in the situation of Shúrek among the Hebrew vowels, and from the name which it still retains among the Persians of پیش Pésh, i. e. *before*.

When the Hebrew and Syriac tongues were vernacular, the vowels would only be wanted in words which would otherwise be ambiguous; and we find in the old Syriac Estrangelo manuscripts, that these vowel marks are mostly added, when this would be the case. Thus, a participle present has almost invariably a point placed over the first radical letter, directing the first consonant to be pronounced with an *o*: the preterite, in like manner, has a single point under one of its radicals,

* See Michaelis' Syriac Gram. pp. 25, 26, 27, 36, 37; G. Amira Gram. Syr. p. 36, 37, &c. De Dieu Gram. Harm. Ed. 1628. pp. 36, 37.

mostly the second, directing that consonant to be pronounced with an *a*. The same is observed in other words, which have the same consonants with each other, but which ought to be pronounced with different vowels. This is sufficient, even now, to guard against any ambiguity which might arise in reading the Syriac text. In most of the Arabic manuscripts, if we except the Koran, a few vowels only are added for a similar purpose; which has also been done by some of the best editors of Arabic books in modern times. In these cases, no one will object, that every danger of ambiguity is sufficiently removed; and it may hence be inferred, that a similar practice would be quite sufficient, so long as the Hebrew language continued to be generally spoken. When, however, it became a dead language, and the Jews, dispersed as they were, into different nations of the earth, would naturally forget the true pronunciation of the sacred text, no less than its meaning in many important passages, it became almost necessary that every word should be fully pointed, so as to leave no doubt on the mind of the reader, as far, at least, as such a system of punctuation would go. For this purpose, additional vowel-marks were added, and some new ones invented. To which also a system of accents seems to have been added, which, taken in the aggregate, composes the system of Hebrew orthography as we now have it. At what exact period this began to take place, it is impossible to say: there is, however, good reason for believing, that it must have been after the times of Jerome, as he makes no mention whatever of it. That it was completed later than the twelfth century is scarcely possible, as the names of most of the vowels and accents are found in the Rabbins of that period. The school of Tiberias, and about the period A. D. 500, has generally been fixed upon as the place and time of their invention; and it is not improbable that they were there and then first partially introduced, and afterwards augmented to the number which we now have.

40. Let us now see how the present system will accord with our hypothesis. A single point placed above a consonant, originally represented either *a* or *o*: the context would determine which of the two should be taken. At present, *Khōlém* (וֹ) has the same situation, and the power of *o*. A point placed under any consonant had the power of *e* or *i*: which of these should be taken, the context would determine. *Khīrík* (ִ) has still that situation, and the power of *i*. All the other vowels marks which stand for *ē*, *e*, or *ĕ*, consist of the same point in the same situation, either doubled, tripled, &c. Thus (ֵ) is open *ē*, (ֶ) the same sound preceding a consonant: of this again, (ֱ) and (ֲ)

are other forms, which still occupy the same situation. Now, in order to distinguish between *o* and *a*, it was necessary that some variation of form should take place; and this could not be done better than by lengthening out the point a little, so as to become a straight line, thus (–). The next question would be, where it should be placed. It could not, with propriety, be placed above the line, because a similar straight line had already been placed there, in order to determine the pronunciation of certain consonants.* It was, therefore, placed below the line of consonants, and pronounced *a:* and for the sound of the open *ā*, the point was added, thus (ֲ), which in printed books is usually found thus (ָ), although the manuscripts mostly preserve the original form. The *Shūrék*, or *ū*, probably still retains its ancient power and situation, as already remarked: and when the ו *Vaw* is dropped, which is sometimes the case, the *Kibbúts* (ֻ) was probably invented to supply its place. This appears to me sufficiently to account for the forms of the vowels, as we now have them; and also, to determine their authority. In many instances, indeed, the simpler vowel points of the ancients may have come down to our times; the rest have probably been supplied by the help of tradition: but, as it is impossible now to say in what words or syllables these ancient vowels are to be found, we can allow to the whole no greater authority than that of men equally liable with ourselves to error.

On the Combination of the Vowels with the Consonants.

41. Considering, as we do, all the letters of the alphabet as consonants, no possible difficulty can arise from their combination with the vowels, when the consonants precede, as is the case in our exemplifications, given with the tables of the vowels (Art. 29.); but, when a consonant also follows, some questions may arise as to the conjoint effect produced. This we now proceed to explain.

42. The only difficulty that can present itself to a learner, will be in the concurrence of the letters אהוי termed *Ĕhĕvi*, with certain vowels preceding.

43. It has been remarked (Art. 24.), that these letters will occasionally lose their consonantal powers. We now

* רָפֶה *Rāphé*, which will be noticed hereafter.

say, this happens only when they are preceded by those vowels which are, or may become, homogeneous with them in sound, respectively. In this sense א may be quiescent in (ֶ) (-) (ֵ) (ִ) (ֹ) or (ֻ), as may also ה. ו will be quiescent in *Khōlém* or *Shūrék* only: and י in *Khīrík, Tsēré, Sēgól,* and occasionally in (ֶ); as, בָּא, בָּהּ, בּוֹ, בִּי, עָלֶיךָ, &c. The reason of this seems to be, that as these consonants are made up of sounds allied to those of the vowels respectively, when the vowel precedes both coalesce, and the consonantal power is lost in that of the vowel. When these letters have no vowel, they will of course be silent, as in חֵטְא *Khét;* הֵבִיא *Hēví,* where they are said to be *otiose.*

44. But when a vowel precedes which is not homogeneous with the consonant, which will happen only in the cases of ו and י, a diphthongal sound will be formed, as *ai* in אֲדֹנָי *Ădōnaí, oi* in גּוֹי *Goi, ui* in גָּלוּי *Gă-lúi.* Other diphthongs may be formed; but more do not occur in Hebrew.—It must be remembered, however, that if any of these letters has a vowel of its own, i. e. following it, it will not become quiescent.

There are, moreover, some instances in which two such letters are found following a vowel, which is homogeneous with neither of them, as אֲלָיו, עָלָיו, and the like; in which, according to analogy, ◌ָי should become the diphthong *ai,* and the last letter ו be considered either as a consonant, or combining with the foregoing in a kind of triphthong, as *Ē-laiv,* or *Ē-laiu, Ḥā-laiv,* or *Ḥā-laiu,* but, generally, the י is considered as being quiescent,*

* It seems to be a general rule, that when (ְ) quiescent, either expressed or understood, comes under י or ו, the diphthongal sound takes place: in other cases these consonants become quiescent, as in אֲלָיו or עָלָיו, where it would be contrary to usage to supply a Sheva (ְ) under the י, as אֲלָיְו and עָלָיְו.

and the following ו read as the consonant *v*, or *w*, as *Ē-lav*, or *Ē-law*, and so on. Indeed, in the case of the diphthong, it is of little consequence whether we consider the concluding letter as a vowel or a consonant, i. e. whether we sound י as *i*, or *y*, ו as *w*, or *v*.

On SHEVA *and its* SUBSTITUTES.

45. *Shĕvá* (ְ) has two situations; one at the beginning of a syllable, the other at its ending. At the beginning of a syllable, (where it may be said to be *initial*,) it is pronounced like a very short *e*, as mentioned in the Table (Art. 29.). The only question, then, which can arise here will be, How is it to be known when this mark begins, or concludes, a syllable? The answer is this: Whenever it is found at the beginning of a word, it must necessarily be considered as commencing the syllable; and consequently, must be pronounced as a short vowel, otherwise the consonant under which it is placed, cannot be uttered at all: as in the word בְּבֵית *Bĕvá-ith*. The same holds good whenever it follows a *perfect vowel* unaccompanied by a tone-accent: because, as that vowel must conclude the preceding syllable, the consonant, under which this mark is found, must necessarily commence the next. In this case, therefore, as before, it must be enounced as a very short vowel, as in the word הֵיתָה *Hā-yĕthá*; in this case, also, it may be termed *initial*.

46. When, however, *Shĕvá* (ְ) commences a word, (and must therefore be audible,) but is, by accident, preceded by some particle with an imperfect vowel, it will become quiescent; e. g. גְּבוּל *Gĕvúl, a boundary;* prefixing לְ for לְ, we shall have לִגְבוּל *Lig-vúl*, not *Ligĕ-vúl*.

47. In the next place, whenever the mark (ְ) *Shĕvá* follows an imperfect vowel, having no tone-accent either

expressed or implied, the consonant under which it is found must be taken as the last of a syllable. In this case, therefore, *Shĕvá* (ְ) will have no sound, and may be said to be *quiescent* or *final:* e. g. קַמְתֶּם *Kam-tém,* not *Kamĕ-tém.*

48. To these rules, however, there are two exceptions of very extensive application: and these arise from the introduction of an accent. For, as it has already been remarked (Art. 34.), the operation of an accent will give to a *perfect* vowel the character of an *imperfect* one, and *vice versâ.* In these cases, therefore, *Shĕvá* (ְ) may be *quiescent* after a perfect vowel, and *initial* after an imperfect one: e. g. of the first case, בָּחַרְתָּ *Bā-khár-tā,* 1 Kings iii. 8, תָּגֵלְנָה *Tā-gél-nā,* Ps. li. 10; and of the second, וַיְהִי *Vā-yĕhí,* &c. When, however, such accent is purely euphonic, this does not always take place; as מַחְבַּרְתּוֹ *Makh-bar-tó,* Exod. xxxix. 20, &c.*

49. *Shĕvá* is rarely written at the end of a word. The reason probably is, that as no vowel can follow the last letter of any word, it would be superfluous to express *Shĕvá* in order to shew this: the mark is consequently omitted. In one case, however, in which the preceding consonant has also a *Shĕvá* quiescent, it seems to have been added to shew, that no vowel has been omitted through negligence; as in the word קָמְתְּ &c., to distinguish it from קָמָתְ &c. It is also found in the letter

---

* The instances occurring of this kind are numerous: as הָיְתָה *Hā-yĕthá,* Gen. i. 2; ib., ver. 7, הָרָקִיעַ *Hā-rā-kíah;* תֵּרָאֶה *Thē-rā-é,* ib., ver. 9. So also תַּדְשֵׁא *Tad-shé,* ver. 11. In all which cases, the accent does not interfere with the syllabication. So likewise in many cases, wherein the accent marks the tone syllable, and in which there is no euphonic one; as Gen. i. 2, בֹּהוּ *Vó-hū,* חֹשֶׁךְ *Khó-shek,* ib., ver. 3, וַיֹּאמֶר *Vai-yó-mer,* &c. The word תֹּהוּ *Thó-hū,* ib., ver. 2, seems to present two accentuations, viz. one with the emphasis on the *penultima,* the other on the *ultima.*

ה, but this may be considered as being a part of the letter.

A part of one of the substitutes of *Shĕvá* is occasionally found under the last letter of a word; but this can happen only when such letter is one of the gutturals ח, ע, or ה, with *Mappík*. The reason of this substitution seems to be, that as these letters will not admit of the rapidity of utterance which the other consonants will, this vowel, or substitute, is added for the purpose of affording due time for their enunciation; but, here the (ְ) is dropped, as before, and the mark (־) only remains. This mark, which is termed *Furtive Páthakh*, is, however, not to be pronounced after, but before, the letter under which it is placed, as מָשִׁיחַ *Mā-shíăkh*, not *Mā-shí-khă*, *Messiah*, or *Anointed*. The same is the case when the guttural is followed by another consonant having a *Dāgésh* with *Shĕvá;* as, פָּשַׁעְתָּ *Pā-sháăḥt*, הִגְעַתְּ *Hig-gáăḥt;* not *Pā-sháḥăt*, &c.

50. The marks, which have been termed "the Substitutes of *Shĕvá*," are, as it has already been intimated, made to supply the place of *Shĕvá*, with one or other of the guttural letters א, ה, ח, or ע, for the reason just given, with reference to the *Furtive Páthakh*. In many cases, therefore, in which analogy would require the insertion of *Shĕvá* (ְ), whether quiescent or not, upon the occurrence of one or other of the gutturals, some one of these substitutes will take its place. When, for instance, the *Shĕvá* ought to be quiescent, the substitute will universally be that which is homogeneous with the preceding imperfect vowel, i. e. if (־) precedes, (ֱ) will be the substitute; if (ַ), (ֲ); if (ָ) *o*, then (ֳ) will be the substitute. When the *Shĕvá* ought to be *initial*, then the substitute most congenial with such guttural, or with the analogy of the word, will be preferred. In the first

case, א mostly takes (ֲ), occasionally (ָ); ה (ָ), rarely (ַ); ח (ַ), never (ָ); ע always (ַ); (ָ) is never used, unless (ֹ) *Khātúph*, i. e. *o*, precede, or unless it stand in the place of a וֹ *Khōlém*, which has been rejected. In these last cases, however, usage alone can be relied on.

On the Points DAGESH *and* MAPPIK.

51. Some notice has already been taken of *Dāgésh* (Articles 9. 10. 11.); we now have to shew what are its offices. 1st. It will double any letter, which from its situation is capable of reduplication; and, 2dly, it will deprive the letters בְּגַדְכְּפַת of their aspiration. In the first case, whenever any consonant has this point inscribed, and is, at the same time, both preceded and followed by a vowel, such consonant is to be considered as being double, e. g. לִמֵּד *Limméd*. But, if such consonant is not preceded by a vowel, then it cannot be doubled; and in that case, it is found only in the letters בְּגַדְכְּפַת, inscribed merely for the purpose of taking away their aspiration. Now, this mostly takes place when such letter commences a syllable, as כַּף *Caph*, בֵּן *Ben*, &c.; in some when it ends it, as קָמַתְּ *kamt*. It must be remembered, that whenever any one of these letters is in a situation to be doubled, the aspiration will also be taken away by the influence of this point, e. g. כִּפֶּר *Kippér*.

52. In the first of these cases, this mark has been termed *Dāgésh forte*, in the second, *Dāgésh lene*; terms, it must be confessed, ill chosen to designate the offices just described. I should prefer terming it *Dāgésh* in every case, its situation being always sufficient to determine its powers, according to our rule.

53. *Mappík* is a single point (like *Dāgésh*) inscribed in the letter ה only; as הּ. Its office is to shew, that this

letter, when so marked, is to be considered as retaining its consonantal power, and to be treated as such, both in the pronunciation and etymology. The Jews consider it also as extending to the letter י, as in יְהוּדִיָּה, *Yĕhū-diy-yá.*

On the Mark רָפֶה Ra-phe.

54. Formerly when *Dāgésh* was not found in any of the בְּגַדְכְּפַת letters, a mark called רָפֶה *Rā-phé,* was placed above it, in order to shew that the point had not been omitted by mistake. With the ancient Syrians this was nothing more than a point made with red ink. The Hebrews probably wrote it in the same way: but, as this point might be mistaken for the vowel *Khōlém,* when printed, or, for one of the accents, the form of it was altered for a short line thus (-), which is still found in the Hebrew manuscripts,* though very rarely in the printed books.

55. Other points are sometimes found placed over certain words in the Hebrew Bible, the use of which is now unknown. The accounts given of these by the Rabbins may be seen in Buxtorf's Thesaurus Grammaticus, lib. i. cap. v. art. 6, which need not be detailed here.

56. It will be seen by recurring to the table of vowels (Art. 29.), that *Khōlém* is given with a ו *Vaw* for its fulcrum, thus וֹ. The *Vaw,* however, is frequently left out. But, as the letters שׁ *Sín* and שׂ *Shín* are also written with a point on the left or right side, respectively, a question may arise, as to how the *Khōlém* is to be represented in the case of its following שׂ, or preceding שׁ. The answer will be: Supposing any consonant to follow שׁ *Sín;* and this letter to have no other vowel-mark, then will its own diacritical point also stand for *Khōlém;* as שׁנֹה *Sō-né.* In every other case, שׁ will be merely the consonant *s,* as given in the Table (Art. 4.).

57. In the next place, with respect to שׂ *Shín.* Sup-

---

* And in these it is sometimes put over a letter requiring *Dāgésh forte* by analogy, also over א and ה when quiescent.

posing any consonant to precede שׁ *Shín,* having neither Vowel-mark nor *Shĕvá,* then will the diacritical point of שׁ *Shin* stand also for *Khōlém,* thus, בֹּשׁ *Bósh.* But, if the preceding letter have a Vowel or *Shĕvá,* שׁ *Shín* will be used merely as directed in the table of consonants. This expedient has been resorted to, in order to avoid the inconvenience of marking these points twice over, which must otherwise have taken place. It will also be seen in the table of the vowels, that the letter י *Yod* has been placed above the point (·) called *Khīrík Gādól,* in order to determine when it is a *perfect vowel* or not. This י *Yod,* however, is frequently omitted; and, when that is the case, an accent, as it will be seen hereafter, is mostly added to make the distinction. But, as this accent is also sometimes omitted, analogy will then be the only criterion by which it can be known.

58. The learner will also perceive, that *Kāméts,* and *Kāméts Khātúph,* have the same form, viz. (ָ). How then, it may be asked, are they to be distinguished? I answer, whenever any consonant follows the mark (ָ) having also a vowel of its own, it will be seen, that (ָ) must make a *perfect syllable,* and must therefore be the vowel *Kāméts,* as in the word רָפֶה *Rā-phé.* For here, as פ begins the following syllable, the ר with (ָ) must necessarily make a perfect syllable: (ָ) therefore, will be the perfect vowel *Kāméts.* In the next place, (ָ) found under either of the letters וכלב, (Art. 26.) at the beginning of a word, will be *Kāméts;* because, in this case, a contraction must have taken place; as, בָּחֳלִי *Bā-khŏlí,* for בְּחָחֳלִי (Art. 85.), the (ָ) here being compensative for (ֲ) (Art. 11[illegible].). So in בָּאָהֳלֶךָ *Bā-ō-hol-ká,* for בְּהָאָהֳלֶךָ.

The following are the exceptions: 1. Should (ָ֫) *Khātéph Kāméts* follow (ָ), or a (ָ) which has

arisen out of (ֲ) by the operation of the Rule, Art. 116. 2. then will (ָ) be *Kāméts Khātúph*, and must be read as *o*, although an accent accompany it; as פָּעָלְךָ *Pō-ḥol-ká*, in which case the (ָ) being sustained by an accent, becomes equal to the perfect vowel (וֹ). And, 2dly, when the consonant following (ָ) has no vowel, and the syllable is without an accent, (ָ) will be *Kāméts Khātúph*; as, חָכְמָה *Khok-má*, רָנּוּ *Ron-nú*, יִקְבָּץ *Ik-botz*, &c.

59. As to the names of the vowels, &c., they are generally Chaldee or Syriac, whence some have argued that their invention is modern.* But as this will involve questions of no importance to the learner, nothing need be said on the subject here.

60. Whether the pronunciation here ascribed to the different consonants and vowels was that in use in ancient times, it is impossible now to say: nor is it of much importance either to the learner or the critic. That the approximation is near, there cannot be much doubt; and that the system is generally the same is, perhaps, sufficiently certain. But as the Jews differ in their pronunciation in different countries, we have here taken that of the Portuguese Jews, as nearly as it could be obtained, which is generally allowed to be the best.

---

* The heads of the arguments urged on this question may be seen in the Institutiones Ling. Heb. by Schultens, p. 53, &c., or in the Arcanum punctationis revelatum, by Capell, &c.

LECTURE II.

ON THE HEBREW ACCENTS, &c.

61. HAVING given tables of the Hebrew consonants and vowels, with some explanations and rules relating to their powers and use, we now come to consider the accents, and to give a table exhibiting their forms, situations, and names, to be followed, as before, with some observations on their nature and application. The following table given by Alting and adopted by Schultens and Gesenius, has been chosen as sufficiently extensive and explicit for our present purpose.

The word here taken for the purpose of exhibiting the accents, is cited from Isaiah lvii. 18, and signifies, with its affixes, "And I will heal him." The distinctive powers which these accents are believed to possess, we shall omit for the present.

62. The Hebrew accents are found placed below, above, and on a level with, the line of consonants. Those which are found below, are twelve in number: their situations, forms, and names are as follows:—

No.	Sit. and Form.	Name.	
1.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	סִלּוּק or סְלוּק	*Sillúk.*
2.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	אַתְנָח	*Athnákh.*
3.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	טִפְחָא	*Tiphkhá.*
4.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	Do. anterior.*	
5.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	תְּבִיר	*Tĕvír.*
6.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	יְתִיב	*Yĕthív.*
7.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	מוּנָח	*Mūnákh*
8.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	מַהְפַּךְ	*Mahpák.*

* Used in the poetical books alone.

No.	Sit. and Form.	Name.	
9.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	יֵרַח	*Yérakh.*
10.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	מֵרְכָא	*Mercá.*
11.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	Do. כְּפוּלָה	*Id.* doubled.
12.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	דַּרְגָּא	*Dargá.*

Those which are placed above the line of consonants, are eighteen in number. Their names, forms, and situations, are as follows:—

No.	Sit. and Form.	Name.	
1.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	רְבִיעַ	*Rĕviăḥ.*
2.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	*Id.* with גֵּרֵשׁ	*Géresh* in the poetical books.
3.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	זָקֵף קָטֹן	*Zākéf Kātón.*
4.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	זָקֵף גָּדוֹל	*Zākéf Gādól.*
5.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	סְגֹלְתָא	*Sĕgoltá.*
6.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	פַּשְׁטָא	*Pashtá.*
7.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	שַׁלְשֶׁלֶת	*Shalshéleth.*
8.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	זַרְקָא	*Zarká.*
9.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	פָּזֵר	*Pāzér.*
10.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	גֵּרֵשׁ	*Géresh.*
11.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	גְּרָשַׁיִם	*Id.* doubled.
12.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	קַרְנֵי פָרָה	*Karné Phārá.*
13.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	תְּלִישָׁא גְדוֹלָה	*Tĕlīshá Gĕdōlá.*
14.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	תְּלִישָׁא קְטַנָּה	*Tĕlīshá Kĕtannā.*
15.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	קַדְמָא	*Kadmá.*
16.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	זַרְקָא	*Zarká* anterior.
17.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	מוּנָח	*Mūnách* superior.
18.	וְאֶרְבָּאֲהוּ	מַהְפַּךְ	*Mahpák* superior.

The three last are found thus in the poetical books alone.

The accents, found both above and below the line at

the same time, are four. Their names, forms, and situations, are as follows :—

No.	Sit. and Form.	Name.
1.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	*Mahpák* with *Mercá*.
2.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	*Zarká* with *Mercá*.
3.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	*Zarká* with *Mahpák*.
4.	וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ	*Mūnákh* with *Do*.

One only is found in the same line with the consonants.

וְאֶרְפָּאֵהוּ לְנַרְמֵי *Legarmé*, or פְּסִיק *Pĕsík*, according to its order of consecution.

It should be observed, that, as several of these accents have the same form, they are to be distinguished by their positions only. The best way to get acquainted with them is, to write them over a few times, first with, and then without, the tables.

63. Several of these accents are occasionally called by other names in the Rabbinical commentaries, with which the student should be acquainted. *Tiphkhá* is sometimes called טַרְחָא; and, when preceding either *Sillúk* or *Athnákh*, is termed מְאַיְלָא *Meailá*. *Segoltá* is also called סְגוֹלָא, סְגוּלָא, and שְׁגִי, שְׁגִי, *Sĕgōlá*, *Sĕgūlá*, *Shāré*, or *Shré*. *Mercá* כְּפוּלָה, or doubled, is also called תְּרֵין חוּטְרִין *two rods*, or *staves*. *Pashtá* is sometimes called פָּשְׁט *Pāshét*. *Pāzér* is called פָּזֵר קָטֹן *Pāzér Kātón*. *Karné Pārá* is also styled פָּזֵר גָּדוֹל *Pāzér Gādól*. *Tĕlīshá Gĕdōlá* is termed תַּרְסָא *Tarsá*. *Tĕlīshá Kĕtannā*, תַּלְשָׁא *Talshá*, and טַרְסָא *Tarsá*. *Géresh* is termed מֻרְכָּס *Téres*, and preceded by חַדְמָא אַזְלָא, *Azlá*. *Gĕrāsháyim* is also styled מַרְסִים *Tarsáyim*. *Dargá* שׁוֹפָר גַּלְגַּל *Shōphár Galgál*. *Mūnákh* is termed שׁוֹפָר יָשָׁר *Shōphár Yāshár*, and שׁוֹפָר חוֹלֶךְ *Shōphár Hōlék*. *Yĕthív* is styled שׁוֹפָר מְהֻדָּם *Shōphár Mukdám*, and שׁוֹפָר מַשְׁפֵּל *Shōphár Mashpél*. *Mahpák* שׁוֹפָר חַפּוּךְ *Shōphár Happúk*. *Yérakh* is also called גַּלְגַּל *Galgél*. *Mūnákh*, immediately preceding *Athnákh*, *Zāképh Kātón*, or *Zarká*, is termed עִלּוּי *Hillūí*; but when on the penultimate syllable of any word, and followed by either of these accents, it is termed מְכַרְבֵּל *Mĕcarbél*. *Kadmá*, when occupying the place of the Euphonic accent *Métheg*, is termed מֻקְדָּם *Mazzé*. *Mercá* is termed מֵרְכָא פְּשׁוּטָא *Mercá Pĕshūtá*, and מְאֵרִיךְ *Māărīk*. The last

of these terms is applied to *Métheg*, whenever it is added for the purpose of completing a syllable, i. e. of pronouncing an imperfect, like a perfect vowel.

64. Some of these accents are confined to the first, some to the last, and others to the tone, syllable of the word to which they are attached.

65. Those on the first syllable are termed *Prepositives;* those on the last, *Postpositives.* The rest are named as above.

66. The *Prepositives* are, ֒ *Tĕlīshá Gĕdōlá,* ֑ *Yĕthĭv;* and in the poetical books, ֕ *Tiphkhá anterior,* ֪ *Géresh,* with *Rĕvĭaḥ,* and sometimes ֣ *Mūnákh* and ֭ *Zarká.*

67. The *Postpositives* are, ׀ *Pĕsík,* in every case, ׃ *Sĕgoltá,* ׆ *Pashtá,* ֭ *Zarká,* and ֒ *Tĕlīshá Kĕtanná.*

68. When any of these Prepositives or Postpositives are found in any word, the tone-syllable can be known only by analogy.*

69. Various offices have been ascribed to these accents. By some they are thought to have been attached to the sacred text, in order to regulate the tone of voice, either in reading or chanting. Others have supposed them to have been affixed for the purpose of dividing it into its several members, as verses, the larger and smaller members of sentences, &c. and to point out the different dependencies which these parts have upon one another. Others, again, have assigned to them emphasis, parenthesis, parallelism, &c. while others have given them all these offices together. Some, again, have supposed them to be of divine, others of human, origin. In the present work we shall consider their application to the text, as the best grammarians usually have done, viz. as intended to divide the context into its different members, and to determine (for the most part) the tone-accent of the words in which they are found. As to their authority, we cannot allow it to be divine, until better proofs than any hitherto offered are afforded on that point. As coming from men, who had perhaps made the Hebrew Bible the study of their lives, they are valuable. They may, nevertheless, be rejected, whenever a more convenient division can be discovered.

70. These accents are again divided, with respect to their offices, into *Tonic,* and *Euphonic,* accents.

---

* See the שער התגינות appended to Buxtorf's Bible, last paragraph.

71. The tonic accent, (which occurs, for the most part, alone,) however situated, can affect only the ultimate or penultimate syllable of any word, which it does by directing the emphasis to be placed on that syllable. When the *Prepositive* or *Postpositive* accents are used, the syllable on which the emphasis is to be placed can be known only by the analogy of the word. In other cases, the accent will point it out.

72. When a word has more than one tonic accent, and both happen to be the same, the first will have the emphasis; as תֹּהוּ *Thó-hū:* but, when they are not the same, the last will have it; e. g. וּלְמוֹעֲדִים *Ū-lĕmō-ădím.*

73. Generally, all words either being, or terminating in the form of, Segolates, will have the emphasis on the penultimate syllable: all others on the ultimate.

74. The *Euphonic accent* supplies a sort of secondary emphasis to the syllable on which it is found, which can never be the ultimate of any word, nor the penultimate of those having the Segolate form.

Of this sort, modern grammarians count two, *Métheg* מֶתֶג, and *Makkáph* מַקֵּף. The former of these has the same form with Sillúk (ׂ), but, as it can never hold the same situation, the distinction is easily made. The latter takes the form of our hyphen; as in אֶת־כֹּל *Eth-kól,* and generally deprives the preceding word of its tone-accent. In neither case is their insertion always solitary; for, several *Méthegs* are sometimes found in the same word, and several words are occasionally connected by the operation of *Makkáph.* Particular rules for their insertion will be given hereafter.

75. One mark more it may suffice to notice here, and that is, a small circle sometimes found over a word in the Hebrew context; thus, הַלָּ֫א. The word over which this mark is found is said to be כְּתִיב *Kĕthíw,* or *written;* and the mark itself is intended to direct the

attention of the reader to some note to be found either in the margin, or at the foot of the page. For the most part, it directs the reader to a various reading, on the right side of which we find the word קְרִי *Kĕrí*, which means either *reading* or *read.** The readings thus pointed out in the Hebrew Bible amount to about 1000, and are generally preferred to those found in the text. The far greater part of them have been found by Kennicott and De Rossi in the MSS. which they collated.†

76. Having thus far explained the powers of the several consonants, vowels, accents, &c., and given some rules on the subject of their combination, we now proceed to a portion or two of the Hebrew text, in exemplification of what has been said. The passage we shall first take is, Zephaniah iii. 8, in which we have all the letters of the Alphabet, with most of the vowels, and other marks. In reading this, we would advise the learner to read each syllable distinctly, with a slight pause; and to continue this practice, until he is perfectly familiar with all the consonants, vowels, &c.

8	7	6	5 4	3 2	1
לְעֵד	קוּמִי	לְיוֹם	נְאֻם־יְהוָה	חַכּוּ־לִי	לָכֵן
lĕhád	*Kū-mí*	*lĕyóm*	*Yĕhō-váh‡-nĕum*	*lí-khak-kū*	*Lā-kén*

15	14	13	12	11	10	9
לִשְׁפֹּךְ	מַמְלָכוֹת	לְקַבְּצִי	גּוֹיִם	לֶאֱסֹף	מִשְׁפָּטִי	כִּי
lish-pók	*mam-lā-kóth*	*lĕkov-tsí*	*gō-ím*	*lē-ĕsóph*	*Mish-pā-tí*	*kí*

---

* The form of this word is most probably that of פָּקִיד or כָּתִיב, which written at length would be קָרִיא *read*, as a participle. But in this case, the quiescent final letter is frequently dropped. For an explanation of the Masoretic marks the Tiberias of Buxtorfius should be consulted.

† Kennicott's Dissertatio generalis. §. 39. De Rossi Proleg. §. xxxix.

‡ This word is pronounced אֲדֹנָי *Ădō-nái* by the Jews, whenever it is found as pointed above: but, when it precedes the word אֲדֹנָי in the text, it then takes the points of the word אֱלֹהִים *Ĕlōhím*, thus יְהוִה, and is then pronounced *Ĕlōhím*. This is a mere Jewish superstition, derived from a considerable antiquity; it having been their opinion, that this name ought to be pronounced by none except the High Priest, and by him only once in the year.

23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16
קִנְאָתִי	בְּאֵשׁ	כִּי	אַפִּי	חֲרוֹן	כֹּל	זַעְמִי	עֲלֵיהֶם
kin-ā-thí	*bĕ-ésh*	*kí*	*ap-pí*	*khărón*	*kól*	*zah-mí*	*hălē-hém*

26	25	24
הָאָרֶץ׃	כָּל־	תֵּאָכֵל
hā-á-rets-kol		*tē-ā-kél*

The learner will recollect, that he is to read, beginning at the right, and proceeding towards the left, hand (Art. 3.); and that the consonants must precede the vowels (Art. 31.). The numbers are added to shew the order of the words. Let us now proceed to analyse the syllables, &c.

In No. 1, we have *Lámed* with *Kāmétz*, making the open syllable *Lā*. After this we have *Caph* with *Tsēré*, followed by *Nún*, making the syllable *kén*. Here, according to our system of syllabication, we should have had some imperfect vowel under the *Caph*, (Art. 34.), which would have been sufficient to make this syllable perfect; but the accent *Mahpák* being added, the anomaly is corrected (Art. 34.).

No. 2. *Khéth* with *Páthakh*, followed by *Caph* having the point *Dāgésh* inscribed: and, as a vowel follows this letter, it must be doubled, the point is, therefore, *Dāgésh forte* (Art. 51.). The first syllable, consequently, is *khak;* the second is *kú*, which is composed of the second *Caph*, and the vowel *Shūrék*. We then have the mark called *Makkáph*, which is used to connect numbers 2 and 3 together, like our hyphen (Art. 74.).

No. 3. *Lámed* with *Khīrík*, followed by *Yód*, making the open syllable *li;* to this is added the tonic accent *Pashtá*, which may be represented by *lí*.

No. 4. we have *Nún* with *Shĕvá*. In this case *Shĕvá* is very slightly pronounced (Art. 45.); but it is not reckoned as a syllable. In the next place we have *Álef* with *Kibbúts* followed by *Mem*. This syllable, therefore, must be pronounced *úm*, in which *u* has the sound of *oo* in *good*. The whole word will then be *nĕúm*, in which the *ĕ* will be passed over as rapidly as possible. We then have the mark *Makkáph*, as before.

No. 5. is the word *Jehovah*, pronounced *Yĕhō-vá*. Here *Shĕvá* is passed over rapidly as before. The point over the left limb of *Hé* is the vowel *Khōlém;* and, as the *Vaw* following has a vowel of its own, it is not quiescent in the preceding vowel *Khōlém*, which it otherwise

would be (Art. 42—44.). The first syllable, therefore, including the *Shĕvá*, will be *Yĕhō*, the next *Váh*, in which the terminating *He* will be quiescent in the preceding *Kāmétz*. Over the *Vaw* commencing this last syllable, we have the accent *Zāképh Kātón*. In no respect, therefore, can the mark (ֽ) under this *Vaw* be a *Kāmétz Khātúph*. (Art. 58.).

There now occurs nothing worth remark till we come to No. 11. In the word לְאֵסֹף *Lē-ĕsóph*, then, the first syllable consists of *Lāméd* with *Sēgól*, accompanied by an Euphonic accent (Art. 74.) called *Métheg*, making a perfect syllable (Art. 34.). This syllable, therefore, is open *Lē*. The *Álef* following, with *Khātéph Sēgól*, which is a substitute of *Shĕvá* (Art. 50.) does not constitute a syllable; and, therefore, it is passed over as rapidly as convenient in connection with the following syllable *Sóph;* and this has the tonic accent *Pashtá* (Art. 62.).

No. 12. The first syllable consists of *Gīmél* with *Khōlém*, followed by *Vaw*, *quiescent*, i. e. *Vaw* following an homogeneous vowel, and having no vowel of its own, and, therefore, *silent* (Art. 42—3.). The next syllable is commenced by *Yód*, with *Khīrík* following; and which, by analogy, should be followed by another *Yód*, as יִם *Yim*, or *ím* (Art. 14.): but this *Yód* is frequently omitted, as it will be seen hereafter. *Khīrík* thus situated is nevertheless a perfect vowel: and, as the syllable also ends with a consonant, the accent *Géresh* is added to compensate for the anomaly (Art. 34.).

No. 13. לְקַבְּצִי. Here the first letter has an *Initial Shĕvá*, which will be passed over rapidly. In the next place we have ק *Koph* followed by (ֽ) either *Kāmétz* or *Kāmétz Khātúph*. It cannot be *Kāmétz*, because it precedes a consonant which has no vowel of its own, and is accompanied by no accent, (Art. 58.) The first syllable, therefore, will be *Lĕkov*, and the last, *tsí*, which need not be explained.

On No. 14. it will be only necessary to remark, that the point placed over the middle of the letter כ is the accent *Rĕvîăḥ*, and not the vowel *Khōlém*, which indeed follows that letter. A recurrence to the tables will always be sufficient to shew, that *Rĕvîăḥ* is placed over the middle of a consonant, *Khōlém* always on the one side.

No. 19. is one syllable only; the *Khātéph Páthakh* (ֲ) found under the ח *Kheth*, being one of the substitutes of *Shevá*, is not counted in the syllabication.

The names of the different accents will be found by turning to the table, (Art. 62,) with which the Learner

will do well in making himself familiar: otherwise, he will occasionally confound them with the vowels, and, in many instances, be unable to determine whether *Shĕvá* begins, or ends a syllable, or, whether the mark (ֽ) be *Kāméts,* or *Kāméts Khātúph:* and for this purpose, we shall subjoin a passage, in which the greater part of them is found. We shall add the syllables in Roman letters, as in the last, in order to facilitate the reading.

2 KINGS I. 6.

וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו אִישׁ עָלָה לִקְרָאתֵנוּ וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵינוּ
ē-lē-nú vai-yó-mer lik-rā-thé-nū ḥā-lá īsh ē-láw Vai-yō-mĕrú

לְכוּ שׁוּבוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־שָׁלַח אֶתְכֶם וְדַבַּרְתֶּם
vĕdib-bar-tém eth-kém shā-lákh—ăsher ham-mé-lek—el shū-vú lĕkú

אֵלָיו כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הֲמִבְּלִי אֵין־אֱלֹהִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אַתָּה
at-tá bĕis-rā-él ĕlō-hím—ēn hămib-bĕlí Yĕhō-vá ā-már kó ē-láw

שֹׁלֵחַ לִדְרֹשׁ בְּבַעַל זְבוּב אֱלֹהֵי עֶקְרוֹן לָכֵן
lá-ken ḥek-rón ĕlō-hé zĕvúv bĕvá-ḥal lid-rósh shō-lĕăkh

הַמִּטָּה אֲשֶׁר־עָלִיתָ שָׁם לֹא־תֵרֵד מִמֶּנָּה כִּי־מוֹת
móth—kī mim-mén-nā thē-réd—lō shám ḥā-lí-thā—ăsher ham-mit-tá

תָּמוּת:
tā-múth

It will not be necessary to point out the names of the different vowels and accents found in this extract, as the Learner will easily find them by recurring to the tables. It may be necessary, however, to remark, that the accent found between the third and fourth words is termed *Lĕgarmé,* not *Pĕsík.* The distinction consists in this: that when the accent *Mūnákh* precedes the mark (׀) it is then termed *Lĕgarmé.* When it is termed *Pĕsík,* some other accent always precedes.

The Learner cannot now do better than take a Hebrew Bible and transcribe a chapter or more at a time, in

Roman letters, divided into syllables as given above; and, this he should continue until he is familiar with the syllabication. After this he may read, which he had better do, aloud, until he finds no difficulty in enouncing every word fully and correctly. A little perseverance will accomplish this: and when he has succeeded, he will find his progress both easy, and delightful.

LECTURE III.

ON THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES WHICH PREVAIL IN REGULATING THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

77. It is well known that changes take place in the consonants and vowels of all languages, which can be accounted for on no other principle than that of euphony. Certain vowels and consonants would, in some situations, introduce sounds so difficult of utterance and so grating to the ear, that conversation would become painful both to the speaker and hearer. In order to avoid this, changes are found to take place in the constitution of words, which, at first sight, appear to be anomalous, and give great trouble to the learner until the laws by which they are regulated are understood. In no language is this more apparent than in the Hebrew and some of its dialects, particularly the Arabic. In the Sanscrit it prevails, perhaps, to a still greater degree; and is found in its descendant the Greek to give more trouble to the learner than any thing else brought under his observation. It is our intention to commence our investigation of the principles of the Hebrew language by detailing the rules by which these apparent anomalies are regulated, for the purpose of enabling the learner to account for the different forms of words as they occur. Because, until he has some knowledge of this subject, he will meet with scarcely any thing but difficulty; and may, indeed, after a study of some years, be induced to confess that he is still a beginner.

78. It has been remarked, (Art. 42, &c.) that the letters contained in the technical word אֲהָוִי, will occasionally lose their consonantal power, or, become quiescent in the sound of the preceding vowel, so that the pronunciation of the word will continue the same whether

these letters be written or not: and the consequence is, they are often omitted; as, פֹּקֵד for פּוֹקֵד, דִּבְרֵם for דִּבְרִים, אֹתֹת for אוֹתוֹת, שֵׂת for שְׂאֵת, תִּנַּשֶּׂנָה for תִּנַּשֶּׂאנָה *they* (fem.) *approach*, מַלָּכֶם for מַה־לָּכֶם *what* (is it) *to you?* יָדַעְתִּי for יָדַעְתִּי *I have known*, &c. And, *vice versa*, these letters will occasionally be inserted when the analogy does not require them: as פָּקוֹד for פָּקֹד, קָאם for קָם,* &c.

79. Hence, when *Shĕvá* (:), or one of its Substitutes, happens to be initial, and to precede one of the letters אֶהֱוִי, a contraction generally takes place, by which both (:) and the אֶהֱוִי letter is rejected, and the following vowel drawn back to the place of the rejected *Shĕvá*; e. g. שֵׂת for שְׂאֵת, אֹמַר for אֶאֱמַר, בַּבַּיִת for בְּהַבַּיִת, יַקְדִּיד for יַהְקְדִּיד, יָקֻד for יָהְקֻד, חֵק for חֶהְיֵק, כִּי for כְּוִי, רִי for רְוִי, גָּלוּ for גָּלְהוּ, יָמִים for יָוֹמִים, (pl. of יוֹם *day*,) עָרִים for עָיְרִים, (*cities*, pl. of עִיר,) רָאשִׁים for רָאֹשִׁים (pl. of רֹאשׁ *head*, where, however, the א is retained.)

80. When any of the letters אֶהֱוִי terminate a word, and have no vowel either preceding or following them, they are often rejected: as, שָׁבִי for שְׁבִיָה *a captive*, גַּי for גַּיְא *a valley*, קָו for קָוֶה *a line*, צַו for צָוָה *a precept*, עַד for עַדְיָ or עֲדָן (passing) *yet, ever, eternal.*

When these letters remain, they are said to be *otiose* (Art. 43.), which may happen either in the middle, or at the end of a word: as הֵבִיאתָ *thou broughtest*, גֵּיא *a valley*.

Hence it is, that ה standing as the third letter of a root, and losing its vowel, is rejected: as, יִגֶל for יִגְלֶה, originally יִגְלֵהּ *he reveals*, יִשֶׁל for יִשְׁלֶה, &c. This case is termed *Apocope*. The reason of it, as will be seen hereafter, is the removal of the accent.

81. Any one of the letters ה, ו, or י, when preceded and followed by a vowel, will occasionally be dropped: as, פְּקַדְתִּים for פְּקַדְתִּיהֶם *I visited them;* פָּקְדוּם for פָּקְדוּהֶם *they visited them;* קָם for קָוָם *he stood;* בָּן for בָּיַן *he understood;* שֶׂה for שֶׂיֶה *a lamb*, &c.

82. Either of the letters י or נ when *initial*,† and נ generally when

---

* Hence it is that the letters אוי, for ה rarely occurs in such situation, have been termed "Matres lectionis," and supposed to have been used as vowels at some former period.

† Mr. Stewart, after Gesenius, has given יָרַד for רַד Jud. xix. 11; תַּתָּה for נָתַתָּה 2 Sam. xxii. 41, &c.; שׁוּב for יָשׁוּב Jer. xlii. 10, as instances that י or נ having a vowel, is dropt by the aphæresis. For my part, I doubt whether these are not rather infinitives than preterites: and if they are so, the elision comes under the above rule.

terminating a syllable, and having a *Shĕvá* (:), will be dropt: as, לֶדֶת for יָלֶדֶת *bearing a child*; דַּעַת for יָדַעַת *knowledge*; גַּשׁ for יִגַּשׁ *approach*; וַיִּגַּשׁ for וַיִּגְּשׁ *he drawes near*; יִפְקֹד for יִפְקֹד, for יִתְפְּקֹד; אַף for אַנְף *anger*; אֱמֶת for אֲמָנְתִּ *truth*. In the last case, as the נ is withdrawn, the following letter will, when possible, be doubled by *Dāgésh*, which may therefore be considered as being compensative. ל likewise in the verb לקח, when it ought to take (:) *Shĕvá* by analogy, is dropt: as, קַח for לָקַח *take*.

The reason of these elisions seems to be, that as the י would be enounced with some difficulty with an initial *Shĕvá*, and the נ in either case, on account of its being a nasal, both have been neglected in writing.

83. When the last two letters of any root, and occasionally in derivatives, happen to be the same, one of them is usually dropt: as, סָבַב for סָבְבַב *he surrounded*; סֹבֵב for סֹבְבֵב *surrounding*; עַם for עַמְּם *a people*; אֵם for אִמְּם *a mother*; which, however, will return (by *Dāgésh*) when any asyllabic augment is made: as, סַבּוּ *they have surrounded*; עַמִּי *my people*, &c. In this case, the rejection has probably taken place, in order to avoid an ambiguity which might arise from the operation of a rule hereafter to be considered, by which the Learner or Reader may possibly misunderstand this for a reduplication, introduced for the purpose of emphasis, or the like.

84. Letters of the same organ are, on account of a similarity of sound prevailing among them, sometimes changed for one another: *e. g.*

1. Labials: גַּב, גֵּו, or גַּף *the back*; בְּרִיא or מְרִיא *fat*; מָלַט or פָּלַט *he escaped*.

2. Palatals: סָגַר or סָכַר *he shut up*; רָגַל or רָכַל *he travelled*; כּוֹבַע or קוֹבַע *a handle*.

3. Linguals: חָטַף or חָתַף *he robbed*.

4. Sibilants: עָלַז or עָלַס or עָלַץ *he exulted*; זָעַק or צָעַק *he cried out*; שָׂחַק or צָחַק *he laughed*.

5. Gutturals: כָּאָה or כָּהָה *he was weak*; אָנַם or עָנַם *he was mournful*.

85. In a few instances, letters of different organs are changed one for another: as,

1. Sibilants for Linguals: זָעַף or דָּעַף *he quenched*; נָצַר or נָטַר *he watched*; בְּרוֹשׁ or בְּרוֹת *a fir tree*; חָרַשׁ or חָרַת *he engraved*.

2. Liquids for one another: לָחַץ or נָחַץ *he oppressed*; הִצְהִיל or הִצְחִיר *he caused to shine*; שָׂמַן or שָׂמַם *he opposed*; מוּט or נוּט *tot-*

tering; עָכָן or עָכָר *a proper name.* So נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר *Nĕvūkadnētsar,* or נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר *Nĕvūkadrētsar.*

86. The אֲהֶחָוִי letters, considered either as consonants or quiescents, will occasionally be changed for one another: particularly, when the pronunciation of the word is not materially affected by the change: e. g. בְּלוֹאִים or בִּלּוּיִים *rags;* דּוֹאֵג or דּוֵיג *Dōég,* a proper name; הָלַךְ or יָלַךְ *he went;* קָרְחָה or קָרָחָה *baldness;* מִקְוֶה or מִקְוָה *a collection;* רֹאשׁ or רוֹשׁ *the head;* רְאֵם or רְיֵם an animal so called; רִאשׁוֹן or רִישׁוֹן *the first;* גָּלָה *he revealed,* for גָּלַי, &c.

87. In like manner ג is occasionally found in the place of one or other of the אֲהֶחָוִי letters: as, נָצַב for נָצַג *he set up;* נָאָה for נָאָג *he was beautiful.* So in the Syriac, נֶהֱטוֹל for נֶהֱטוּל *he kills.*

88. The letters of a syllable are sometimes transposed; as, כְּסִל for סָכַל *he was foolish;* שֶׂה for כֶּבֶשׂ *a lamb;* נָשַׁף for נָפַשׁ *he breathed;* פָּצַר for פָּרַץ *he broke out;* אָנַק for נָאַק *he sighed;* גְּאָיוֹת for גַּיְאוֹת *vallies:* and, in some cases, a letter is transposed to another syllable: as, עַלְוָה for עַוְלָה *wickedness;* שַׂלְמָה for שִׂמְלָה *a garment.*

These changes and transpositions (i. e. from Art. 84. to this place) do not affect the grammar of the language. Their principal use is, to enable the student to ascertain what roots, &c. are said to be cognate; that is, are related to one another in their radical letters; and, having the same, or very nearly the same signification, are often used one for another. The preceding, as well as the following, affect the grammatical forms of words.

89. When the ת of the *Hithpāhél* species of conjugation would, by analogy, precede any of the Sibilant letters (Art. 22.), a transposition, and occasionally a change, of that letter will take place: e. g. In the first case: הִסְתַּכֵּל for הִתְסַכֵּל *he loaded himself;* הִשְׁתַּמֵּר for הִתְשַׁמֵּר *he caused to keep.* In the second: הִצְטַדֵּק for הִתְצַדֵּק *he justified.* In this case only, is the ת changed to ט.

2. But, when a letter of the same organ with ת (see Art. 22.) follows, both will coalesce by *Dāgésh* being placed in the radical letter: e. g. הִדַּבֵּר for הִתְדַּבֵּר, root דָּבַר *he spoke;* הִטַּהֵר for הִתְטַהֵר, root טָהַר *he was clean;* הִתַּמֵּם for הִתְתַּמֵּם, root תָּמַם *he was complete.*

This coalescence, which has been termed *Assimilation,* is found very generally to prevail: but not without some exceptions, which will be noticed hereafter.

3. In a few instances this principle of assimilation is also found to extend itself to other letters: e. g. הִזַּכּוּ for הִתְזַכּוּ, root זָכַךְ *he was pure;* הִכַּסֶּה for הִתְכַּסֶּה, root כָּסָה *he covered;* הִנַּבֵּא for הִתְנַבֵּא,

root נָבָא *he declared;* אַרְמֵם for אִתְרוֹמֵם, root רוּם *exalting;* תִּשּׁוֹמֵם for תִּתְשׁוֹמֵם, root שָׁמַם *he desolated,* &c.

90. Letters are sometimes added, either for the purpose of facilitating the pronunciation, or, for modifying the signification of words: e. g. in the first case: אֶתְמוֹל for תְּמוֹל *yesterday;* אֶזְרוֹעַ for זְרוֹעַ *the arm.** In the second: אַכְזָר *most cruel,* from כְּזָר *cruel,* &c. Of this kind, are the paragogic letters, as well as those used in forming the different species of nouns, conjugations, &c., of which an account will be given hereafter. The first of these cases is termed *Prosthesis;* the second *Epenthesis, Paragoge, Hĕĕmanthí,* &c. according to their different offices and uses.

91. Letters are occasionally dropped (Art. 79. 82.), so also ם, (and ן in the Syriac, Chaldaic, and Arabic,) terminating words in the plural number, when those words happen to be in the state of *definite construction,* of which more hereafter. ן likewise, in a very few instances at the end of proper names: as, מְגִדּוֹ for מְגִדּוֹן, for the reason given in Art. 82.

On the Contractions which take place in the Vowels.

92. As it may occasionally happen in combining the vowels with the consonants, that certain sounds may be produced either disagreeable to the ear, difficult of utterance, or, from some reason or other, generally unknown to the people speaking a given language; it is of importance to know in what cases these difficulties are found to take place in the language before us, and by what means their occurrence is obviated.

93. Whenever any vowel not homogeneous with one of the letters י or ו (Art. 43.) happens to precede such letter, a vowel will arise, from the combination, partaking of the sound of both.

1. (-) *Páthakh* preceding ו will become וֹ *Khōlém*: e. g. מוֹת for מַוֶת *death;* יוֹלֵד for יַוְלֵד (for יְהַוְלֵד, Art. 79.) *he begets;* יוֹשֵׁב for יַוְשֵׁב (for יְהַוְשֵׁב *ib.*) *he causes to reside.*†

---

* Of this sort are the words *stablish* and *establish, special,* and *especial,* in English.

† So in the Sanscrit regularly, *a* and *u* become *o*; *a* and *i*, *e*. See the Grammars. From this, and similar cases which will occur, it appears extremely probable, that ו, when a consonant, was originally pronounced like our *w*, as מַלְכוּת *Malkewth,* which is regularly written מַלְכוּת *Malkúth*: and so of others.

2. *Vav* וְ preceded by (ַ) *Khātúph*, (ֻ) *Kibbúts*. (ֹ) *Sēgól*, or (ְ) *Tsēré*, will become וּ: e. g. יוּלַד for יְוֻלַד, or יְוֻלַד (from יָהֻלַד or יְהֻלַד Art. 79.) *he is begotten*; קוּם for קְוֹם *standing*; מַלְכוּת for מַלְכֻוּת (probably for מַלְכְהֻוּת, Art. 79. of מַלְךְ *king*, and הֻוָת or הֻוֹת *being*, root הָוָה *was,) reigning, kingdom*. So יִשְׁתַּחוּ for יִשְׁתַּחֲוֻ, root שָׁחָה for שָׁחָו *he was low*; תֹּהוּ for תְּהֹוָ *emptiness*; בֹּהוּ for בְּהֹוָ *inanity*, &c.

3. In like manner, יְ preceded by (-) *Páthakh*, will become quiescent in (ִ), the (-) disappearing: as, בִּית for בַּיְת *a house*; עִין for עַיִן *an eye*; גִּיא, or by Art. 80, גֵּי for גַּיְא *a valley*; תֵּיטַב for תַּיְטַב (for תְּהַיְטַב or תְּהַיְטִיב, Art. 79,) *it does well*.

4. When the vowels (ֵ) or (ֶ) precede יְ, the contraction will take place in ִי. *perfect*: e. g. בְּרִית for בְּרֵיְת (formed perhaps from בָּרָה *cutting*, and הָיָה or הָיַת from the root הָיָה *he was) a covenant*; רִאשִׁית for רֵאשֵׁיְת *beginning*; אִישׁ for אֶיְשׁ *a man*. So מְרִי for מְרֶיְ *rebellion*; שִׁבְי for שִׁבֵיְ *captivity*; חֲצִי for חֲצֵיְ *half*.

5. In like manner, when *Shĕvá* precedes any perfect or imperfect vowel, or, a substitute of *Shĕvá* follows an imperfect one, a contraction may take place, in which the *Shĕvá* or its substitute will disappear: as, 1st. שְׂאֵת for שִׂאֵת *elevation*; לְקִרְאת for לִקְרַאת *meeting*; יֹאמֶר for יְאֹמֵר *he says*, &c. 2. לֵאמֹר for לֶאֱמֹר *saying*; יָאצֶל for יַאֲצֵל *he separates*; and, by Art. 78, יִטַב for יִיְטַב *he prospers*.

6. The vowel (-) or (ָ) preceding a guttural letter with (ַ) *Kāmĕts*, is frequently changed into (ֲ) for the sake of euphony: as, אֶחָד masc. אַחַת fem. *one*; הֶהָרִים for הָהָרִים *the mountains*.

On the Changes of the Vowels.

93. Could we suppose Hebrew words to remain unaltered as to their original forms, or unvaried in pronunciation with reference to the syllable on which the accent is to be placed, we could also suppose that no variation would ever take place in the vowels. But the fact is, the forms of words vary in order to express the different shades of meaning of which the root is capable: and, from this as well as other causes, the accented syllable will not always remain the same: and, consequently, as the pronunciation of the word thus varied must alter, the vowels accompanying it must vary likewise.

94. Hence it will appear, that two circumstances are to be regarded with reference to the change of the Hebrew vowels. One is,

the etymology or form of the word; the other, the situation of the accent.

96. With respect to the form of the word, this can only be known from rules hereafter to be detailed. The principles, however, upon which words are augmented, may here be considered; and that will be sufficient at the present.

97. Any augment whatever prefixed to a word will not influence our present considerations, as the changes of the vowels do not depend upon that. We now have to do only with augments postfixed to words; because it is upon these alone that such changes depend.

98. These augments, then, may be considered as being of two sorts: one commencing with a vowel, and which may be termed *Asyllabic;* the other with a consonant, which may be termed *Syllabic.**

99. We can readily perceive, that, upon any *Asyllabic* augment being attached to a word, the terminating consonant of such word must be taken in order to enounce it, otherwise it must remain silent, it being contrary to the laws of syllabication for any vowel to begin a syllable (Art. 31.). If then we attach the asyllabic augment יִם., which is the mark of the plural number masculine, to any word, such as עַם *a people*, or בָּר *pure*, we must necessarily take the last letter of either of these words in order to enounce it: and, if by analogy the word have but one terminating letter, then must the preceding syllable necessarily be *perfect;* but, if not, *imperfect;* e. g. בָּר *pure*, (root בָּרָה, the ה being rejected by Art. 78.), adding יִם., we have בָּרִים *Bā-rím, pure ones*, &c. But, taking עַם *a people*, which is derived from the root עָמַם, (one of the radicals being rejected by Art. 83, we have עַם,) and adding יִם. we shall have עַמִּים *Ham-mím, peoples*. It will entirely depend, therefore, upon the analogy of the word whether the preceding vowel is to be perfect or not, due regard being had to the laws of syllabication.

100. In the next place, if our augment is *Syllabic*, as כֶּם, (which is one of the pronominal affixes signifying *your*, and carries the accent with it), and, as Hebrew words generally end in a consonant, the preceding vowel, in such case, must necessarily be *imperfect;* because, both the vowel will be without an accent, and it will be followed by a

---

* The reason of these terms is obvious: a vowel cannot commence a syllable in Hebrew; hence augments thus commencing are termed *Asyllabic*: those commencing with a consonant, are for a similar reason termed *Syllabic*.

consonant: e. g. בָּרְכֶם *Bar-kém, your pure one;* or, עַמְכֶם *Ham-kém, your people.*

101. Hence, it will be seen, that a *perfect* vowel may occasionally become *imperfect;* and, *vice versâ,* an *imperfect* one, *perfect:* i. e. in other words, vowels will be changed for their homogeneous *perfect* or *imperfect* ones, as the rules of syllabication shall require.

102. This correspondence in the vowels, which is termed *homogeneous,* is of two sorts, *Direct,* and *Oblique.*

1. The *direct* correspondence is that of the perfect with the imperfect vowels, respectively, as (ֵ) with (־), (ֶ) with (ִ), &c. as given in the Table (Art. 29.).

2. The *oblique* correspondence is that of vowels in some respects dissimilar; as (ֵ) or (־) with (ֶ) or (ִ); (ֶ) or (ִ) with (ְ) or (ֲ); and (ֹ) with (ֳ).

103. Generally, therefore, when any change of the vowels must take place, in order to comply with the laws of syllabication, those vowels, which are either *directly* or *obliquely* homogeneous with their primitives, will be taken: the *directly* homogeneous ones for the most part: the other cases may be considered as exceptions to be learned from usage.

104. This change of vowels, moreover, will occasionally affect the penultimate syllable of a word, as well as the ultimate. Let us now see, by what laws the change will be regulated in this case.

105. Generally, when the penultimate syllable ends in a *perfect* mutable vowel, that vowel will be rejected, and its place supplied either by *Shĕvá,* or one of its substitutes, according to rules hereafter to be given; but, if that vowel be *immutable,* it will remain unaltered, e. g. affixing ים to דָּבָר *a word,* we shall have דְּבָרִים *Dĕvā-rîm, words:* but, attaching it to פֹּקֵד *visiting,* where the penultimate vowel is immutable by analogy, we have פּוֹקְדִים *persons visiting.*

106. In like manner, if the penultimate syllable end in a consonant, and have no accent, it will remain immutable, whatever be the affix: as, מַקְדִּישׁ *a sanctifier,* מַקְדִּישִׁים or מַקְדִּישָׁם.

107. In all cases, in which the penultimate is *immutable* either by analogy or position, the ultimate vowel, if not immutable by analogy, will be rejected: but, when both are immutable, no change will take place in the vowels, whatever be the affix. Examples of the first case, פָּקוּד *a person visited,* פְּקוּדִים, פְּקוּדָם; of the second, מַבּוּעִים, מַבּוּעָם.

108. The changes to which the vowels are liable from the accidence

of the Grammar, can affect no vowel beyond the penultimate: because, first, the prefixing of any augment whatever to a word does not affect its vowels (Art. 97.); and, secondly, as all syllables beyond the penultimate cannot be affected by the tone-accent, nor consequently, by any augment affixed to such word, the syllables thus situated will remain undisturbed by grammatical accidence.

109. The reason for abridging words, either in the ultimate, or penultimate syllable (for both seldom occur together) when any augment is affixed, seems to be this: Were words thus to be augmented in addition to their own vowels, their length would be inconvenient for the purposes of conversation, which, in every language, is shortened as much as perspicuity will allow. And, on the other hand, as those vowels which have been termed *immutable* constitute the distinctive character of the words in which they are found, perspicuity forbids that any change should take place in them. But, as it is impossible for the learner to know, till he comes to consider the etymology of words, which vowels are to be considered *immutable*, it will be unnecessary to add any thing further on this subject now, especially as it is our intention to point out these vowels as we proceed.

On the Use of Shĕvá and its Substitutes.

110. Having laid down the general laws relating to the changes of the vowels, we now proceed to notice a few affecting the use of *Shĕvá* and its Substitutes. To enter into all the minutiæ about these points, would, we believe, be neither necessary nor agreeable to the student: because, the length and subtilty of the enquiry would not only be embarrassing, but, when brought to a close, would probably leave him in possession of less practical knowledge on the subject, than the use of tables and his lexicon would supply. We shall therefore be brief, contenting ourselves with generals, and noticing a few anomalies as we proceed.

111. *Shĕvá*, with its Substitutes, may be either *initial* or *final* (Artt. 45, 50.). They may be *initial* at the commencement of any syllable, whether that be at the beginning or in the middle of a word. They must be at the end of a syllable when *final*.

112. By grammatical accidence, however, two of these may concur as *initials*: but, as no one of them stands for a vowel, and cannot, therefore, constitute a syllable when in conjunction with any consonant, some change must necessarily take place. And in this case, the first

Shĕvá, or Substitute for *Shĕvá*, will be changed into some imperfect vowel.

Shĕvá so situated, which always happens at the beginning of a word, mostly takes *Khīrík* (·), sometimes *Páthakh* (-) or *Sēgól* (∴): as, 1, יִפְקֹד for יִפְקֹד *he visits*, בִּפְקֹד for בִּפְקֹד *in visiting*: 2, כַּנְפֵי for כִּנְפֵי *wings*, and אֶפְקֹד for אֶפְקֹד *I visit*. The use of *Páthakh* (-), however, is rare, and can be known only from usage: *Sēgól* can occur only with א* or ה.

2. One or other of the Substitutes of *Shĕvá* may concur with *Shĕvá* or with one another, either in the beginning, or in the middle of a word; the change will then be into the imperfect vowel homogeneous with the substitute; e. g. אַנְשֵׁי for אֱנָשִׁי *men*, נֶהְפַּךְ for נֶהְפַּךְ *he is turned*. So, in the middle, פָּעָלְךָ for פָּעָלְךָ *thy work*, יַעַמְדוּ for יַעַמְדוּ *they stand*. There are, however, many exceptions: as נַעֲשָׂה *it is made*, or *done*, masc., but fem. נַעֲשְׂתָה, which can be known by consulting the Concordance or from constant reading only.

3. But, as the substitutes of *Shĕvá* are various, it may be necessary here to state in what cases either of them is preferred; because, upon this will depend the operation of the foregoing rule.

4. Generally, when either of the guttural letters commences a syllable, whether in the beginning or in the middle of a word; and by analogy should take (:) *Shĕvá*, *Khātéph Páthakh* (-:) is mostly taken in its place: e. g. 1. At the beginning of words: אֲבִיהֶם *their father*; אֲחִיכֶם *your brother*; אֲשֶׁר *who, which*; עֲשֵׂה *make thou*. 2. In the middle: גֹּאֲלוֹ *his redeemer*; תִּפְחֲדוּ *fear ye*; צָּעֲדָה *she proceeded*.

5. There is, however, a considerable number of exceptions to this rule:† and, 1st, Several monosyllables with their compounds commencing with א will take (∴) *Khātéph Sēgól* in the place of *Shĕvá*; as, אֱלִימֶלֶךְ *Ĕlīmélek*, a proper name. 2dly, Infinitives and Imperatives of the conjugation *Kal* when commencing with א: as, אֱכֹל *eating*, or *eat thou*; אֱמֹר *saying*, or *say thou*. Also, 3dly, The characteristic ה of the *Hiphḥíl* species, in verbs having the middle radical letter quiescent and receiving some augment: as, הֱשִׁבוֹ *he restored him* or *it*; הֱמִיתָם *he put them to death*. The first person singular mostly follows the general rule, and takes (-:). 4thly, In a few words (∴) is found with ע at the beginning of a word: as, עֱזוּז *strength*;

---

* This is regularly the case in the first person singular of the species *Kal*, *Niphḥál*, and *Pīḥél*, when no guttural letter follows.

† See also Art. 50.

עֶלְוֵי *a pestil;* עֱנוּת *affliction;* עֲרוּךְ *arrayed;* עֲנוּ *respond ye.* 6thly, *Khātéph Sēgól* (ֱ) is also found in the middle of a word: as, הָאֹהֱלָה *towards the tent;* יֹאחֲזוּךְ *they take hold of thee;* וַיֶּחֱמְוּ *and they become inflamed;* יֶחֱמַתְנִי *she conceived me.* 7thly. In the following we have (ֲ) similarly situated: אֶשְׁחֲמָה *I rest;* תִּשְׁחֲדִי *thou* (fem.) *didst bribe.* And, 8thly, Generally, whenever a mutable וֹ is rejected, its place may be supplied by (ֲ) when commencing a word, and frequently when in the middle, whatever be the accompanying consonant: as, חֳדָשִׁים *months,* from חֹדֶשׁ *a month;* אָהֳלִים from אֹהֶל *tent;* חֳדָשִׁים plural of קֹדֶשׁ *holiness,* &c. And, 9thly, Some cases occur in which one or other of these Substitutes is found with a non-guttural letter, and when analogy does not seem to require it: e. g. זָהָב *gold,* Gen. ii. 12; לָקָחָה *she was taken,* ib. ver. 23; and a few others, which may perhaps be attributed to the mistakes of the copyists.

113. When *Shĕvá* ought, by analogy, to *terminate* a syllable, and one or other of the gutturals happens to occupy the place of the terminating consonant, either *Shĕvá* will be used, or one of its substitutes.

1st. *Shĕvá* will be used, 1st, in the second and first persons singular and plural of the preterite, in verbs whose third radical letter is a guttural: as, שָׁמַעְתָּ *thou hast heard,* masc.; שָׁמַעַתְּ *id.* fem., where (-) is furtive, and stands for *Shĕvá* (Art. 49.); שָׁמַעְתִּי *I have heard;* שָׁמַעְנוּ *we have heard;* שְׁמַעְתֶּם *ye have heard,* masc.; שְׁמַעְתֶּן *id.* fem. 2dly, After a tonic accent: as, תִּשְׁמַעְנָה *they* (fem.) *will hear.* 3dly, Occasionally after the vowels (ֹ) (-) and (ֵ) with a servile letter: as, יִהְיֶה *he is,* or *will be;* אַחֲזֵק *I will strengthen;* אֶהְיֶה *I am,* or *will be.* And, 4thly, in some cases which seem to be regulated by usage only: as, זַעְמִי, not זַעֲמִי *my anger.*

2d. In every other case, any guttural letter terminating a syllable, will take that substitute of *Shĕvá* which is homogeneous with the preceding vowel: as, תָּעֳבַד *thou art caused to worship.*

And, 3dly, *vice versâ,* any guttural letter, originally commencing a word, and having a substitute of *Shĕvá* in its own right, by Art. 112. 4. upon being preceded by some particle having *Shevá,* but which by Art. 112, must become an imperfect vowel, will require that such imperfect vowel be homogeneous with that in its own Substitute: e. g. עֲשֹׂה *making,* &c. prefixing יְ, תְ, נְ, &c. which are the personal præformatives of the present tense, we shall have יַעֲשֶׂה *he makes;* תַּעֲשֶׂה

she makes; נַעֲשָׂה *we make,* &c. So with other particles: as, וְ, מִ, לְ, כְּ, בְּ; as, בַּעֲבֹד of בְּעָבְדּ *in making;* לַעֲבֹד, כַּעֲבֹד, &c.

There are, however, certain exceptions, as in the first persons singular of some of the species of conjugation, &c.; as, אֶעֱשֶׂה *I make,* &c, which seems to be derived from עֶשֶׂה as before; all of which will be found in the dictionaries.

114. There are a few other substitutions made for the mark *Shĕvá,* which may be termed *Euphonic.* These take place, for the most part, at the end of words where two *Shĕvás* concurring, by analogy, would introduce some difficulty into the pronunciation.

The vowels introduced in these cases are (ֶ), (ַ), or (ָ). *Sēgól* is generally used when neither of the consonants concerned is guttural; (ַ) when one of them is so; and (ָ) when the first of them is י *Yód:* e. g. מֶלֶךְ for מַלְכְּ *a king;* in which case, the primitive vowel, be that what it may, is generally made to correspond, in sound at least, with the substituted one, for the mere sake of euphony; סֵפֶר for סִפְרְ *a book;* נַעַר for נַעְרְ *a boy;* בַּיִת for בַּיְתְ *a house;* גְּבֶרֶת for גְּבִרְתְ *a lady;* לוֹמֶדֶת *for* לוֹמִדְתְ (fem.) *learning.* So in verbs: יִגֶּל for יִגְלְ (for יִגְלֶה, Art. 80.) *he reveals;* נַגֶּל for נַגְלְ (for נַגְלָה, ib.) *he causes to reveal;* יֶחַר for יֶחְרְ (for יֶחֱרָה ib.), *he becomes hot;* הַעַל for הַעְלְ (for הַעֲלָה) *he raised,* &c. Segolate nouns, having וְ for their middle radical letter, will take (ֶ) *Kāméts* for their first vowel: as, מָוֶת *death;* תָּוֶךְ *middle,* &c.

Rules for the insertion of DAGESH.

115. The guttural letters, viz. א, ה, ח, and ע, to which ר may be added, are, on account of the difficulty with which they are enounced, incapable of being doubled; the consequence is, they cannot receive *Dāgésh forte:* and, as they do not come under the rule relating to the letters בְּגִדְכְּפַת, they are also impervious to the operation of *Dāgésh* when termed *lene. Dāgésh,* therefore, cannot be regularly inscribed in any one of them.* But, when analogy requires its insertion, either the preceding vowel is made *perfect,* by way of compensation, as, בָּרֵךְ *Bā-rék,* instead of בַּרֶךְ *Bar-rék,* in which case it is said to be

---

* In a few instances, however, it is found in ר and א; as, חַרְאִיתֶם, 1 Sam. x. 24; xvii. 25; Gen. xliii. 26; Ezek. xvi. 4: Job xxxiii. 21, &c.

expressed; or, it is reckoned as being so, as, מְרַחֶפֶת *mĕrā-khé-pheth,* instead of מְרַחֶפֶת for מְרַחֶפֶת; here *Dāgésh* is said to be *implied.*

116. Generally, *Dāgésh* is to be inscribed in any one of the letters בְּגַדְכְּפַת, whenever such letter begins a syllable, provided the preceding syllable do not end in a perfect vowel, or in one of the letters אֶהֱוֹי in a quiescent state, or in one of the Substitutes of *Shĕvá;* for then it will not be inscribed in any of these letters. The exceptions are as follows:—

1st. Should the preceding vowel be *perfect,* or the syllable end in one of the quiescent letters אֶהֱוֹי, still, if two of the בְּגַדְכְּפַת letters concur in the commencement of the following word, the first will receive *Dāgésh;* e. g. אֱמוּנָתְךָ בְּפִי* *Ĕmū-ná-thĕkā bĕphí,* Psalm lxxxix. 2. See also Isa. x. 9, Gen. xxxix. 12, &c. *Dāgésh* will also be inscribed, should such perfect vowel or quiescent letter preceding have a *distinctive accent;* or, should the preceding word have any accent on the penultimate. A few exceptions are found when the preceding accent is *conjunctive.*†

2d. When the preceding word ends in ה with *Mappík* (Art. 53.), or one of the letters ו or י, used as a diphthong, *Dāgésh* will be regularly inscribed in any בְּגַדְכְּפַת letter: because, in this case, such letter is considered as being a consonant terminating the preceding syllable, as above: e. g. בְּצִדָּהּ תְּשִׂים *Bĕtsid-dáh tā-sím,* not *thā-sím.* Gen. vi. 16. See also Gen. xvii. 20, xxvii. 41; Ps. li. 17. Hence it is, that after יְהוָֹה or יֱהוִֹה *Dāgésh* may be used, because the former of these is read by the Jews אֲדֹנָי *Ădōnái,* the latter אֱלֹהִים *Ĕlō-hím,* the vowels of which have been applied to the word יהוה. There are, however, a few exceptions to this rule. See Isa. xxxiv. 11: Ezek. xxiii. 42; Ps. lxviii. 18.

117. In the next place, when any one of the בְּגַדְכְּפַת letters occurs, not being at the beginning of a word, but following a *final Shĕvá* (:), it will regularly receive the point *Dāgésh;* as, פָּקַדְתָּ *Pa-kád-tā,* פָּקַדְתְּ *Pa-kádt,* excepting in the following cases.

1st. When this (:) stands in the place originally occupied by either (ֶ) or (ַ), in such word, *Dāgésh* will not be inscribed in the בְּגַדְכְּפַת

---

* Some, however, read this passage without *Dāgésh.*

† Exod. xv. 11, 16. Isa. liv. 12. Jer. xx. 9. Dan. iii. 3; v. 11. Ps. xxxv. 10. Buxtorf.

letter following: e. g. כִּדְבָרֶךָ *kid-vā-ré-kā*, not כִּדְבָּרֶךָ *kid-bā-ré-kā*: the primitive form of which is דָּבָר *dā-vár*. So מַלְכִּי, not מַלְגִּי, from מַלְכִּי or מַלְכִּי. So also בִּלְבָב *Bil-váv*, from לֵבָב *Lē-váv*.

2dly, After an initial *Shĕvá* (:) which must be pronounced, but which will become quiescent, upon some particle being prefixed, (Art. 46.) *Dāgésh* will not be inscribed: as, גְּבוּל *Gĕvúl*: and, prefixing לְ, לִגְבוּל *Lig-vúl*, not *Lig-búl*. So לְבוּשׁ *a vesture*, בְּכִי *weeping*, גְּדִי *a he-goat*, &c. as singulars, and דְּבָרִים *words*, זְכָרִים *males*, חֲבָרוֹת, &c. as plurals. Hence also, Infinitives and Imperatives of the form פְּקֹד, with a suffix or any asyllabic augment, will be excepted: as, רָדְפוֹ *Rod-phó, his persecuting*, שִׁכְבָה *Shik-vá, lie thou down*, &c. in verbs, the last radical letter of which is one of the בְּגַדְכְּפַת letters.

3dly, After *Shĕvá* (:) quiescent, following an imperfect vowel which has arisen out of some one of the substitutes of *Shĕvá* (Art. 112. 2. &c.); e. g. נָא־חַמְדָה *Nā-ḥam-dá*, not נַעֲמְדָה, Isa. l. 8.

But if such *Shĕvá* itself has arisen out of one of these substitutes, *Dāgésh* will be inscribed; as, יַחְפֹּץ *Yakh-póts*, Deut. xxv. 7.

4thly, The affixed pronouns ךָ, כֶם, כֶן, never receive *Dāgésh lene*. The letters בְּגַדְכְּפַת preceding וּת; as, מַלְכוּת *Mal-kúth*, עַבְדוּת *Ḥav-dúth*, יַלְדוּת *Yal-dúth*. So also בֶּגֶד, and נֶגֶד, when receiving any asyllabic augment, the latter in נֶגְדָה *Neg-dá* only, Ps. cxvi. 14;* בִּגְדוֹ *Big-dó*, 2 Kings ix. 13, &c., to which a few others might be added.

118. *Dāgésh*, in its capacity of reduplicating certain letters, is sometimes found at the beginning of words; as, מַה־זֶּה pronounced *Maz-zé*, מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר *Mō-shel Lē-mór*, &c., in which case it is purely euphonic. So also in מִקְדָּשׁ *Mik-kĕdásh* for מִקְדָשׁ *Mik-dásh*, Exod. xv. 17; וָאֶכְרֶהָ *Vá-ek-kĕré-hā* for וָאֶכְרֶהָ, &c.

119. And, on the contrary, there are a few instances, particularly in verbs having one of the liquids either for the second, or the two last radicals, in which every letter is written at length; as, צִלְלוֹ *Tsil-ló*, Job xl. 17; חָנְנֵנִי *Khon-né-nī*, Ps. ix. 14; not צִלּוֹ or חָנֵנִי: and others wherein it is omitted, contrary to analogy; as, שִׁלְחָה for שִׁלְּחָה *she sent*; הַלְלוּ for הַלְּלוּ *praise ye*; חָקְקֵם for חָקְּקֵם, Exod. v. 14, &c.

120. The following anomalies occur in the vowels occasionally, when coming in contact with *Dagésh* EXPRESSED or IMPLIED, &c. The vowel (-) coming before a guttural letter, and containing an implied *Dāgésh* (Art. 115.) is for the sake of Euphony often changed into (ֲ); as,

* Which, however, Ib. ver. 18, has *Dāgésh*, נֶגְדָּה.

אֶחָד (masc.) and אַחַת (fem.) *one*; חֲתָרִים for חַתָּרִים, or more commonly הָתָרִים *mountains*; לְהָבוֹת *flames*; גַּחָלִים *embers*; חַפְּחָה *a leader*; חֲצָרִים *cities*; יִתְנֶחָם *he repented himself*; תִּתְנַחֲלוּ *ye shall possess*; הִטְּהָרוּ *they purified themselves*; הֶאָנֹכִי *is it I?* &c. In some instances, (-) coming before Dagesh forte is changed into (·) *Khīrík*; as, בִּתּוֹ *his daughter*, from בַּת (rather from בִּנְתּ; Arab. بِنْتٌ), Gen. xxix. 6; מִרְגִּים *thorns*, from מוֹרָג, 2 Sam. xxiv. 22. In the same manner, גַּת *a wine-press*; חַת *consternation*; מַד *measure*; מֵסַב *circuitous*; מַס *tribute*; קַף *door-post*; פַּת *morsel*; and צַד *the side*, change (-) into (·) upon receiving any asyllabic increment. The same takes place with the verb מוּת *dying*, similarly situated when in the conjugation *Hiphḥíl*; as, הֲמִתֶּם *ye put to death*, for הֲמַתֶּם, Numb. xvii. 6, &c. The same is found to prevail in the following verbs with syllabic increments; viz. יְלִדְתִּיךָ for יְלַדְתִּיךָ *I have begotten thee*, Ps. ii. 7, &c.; וְרִשְׁתֶּם for וְיָרַשְׁתֶּם *ye shall possess*, Deut. xi. 8, &c.

LECTURE IV.

ON THE GENERAL USE AND SITUATION OF THE ACCENTS.

121. Of the origin and use of these accents very little can now be said with any degree of certainty. Much labour and learning, indeed, have been bestowed on their investigation; but, after all, the conclusions arrived at are beset with so much uncertainty, that some of the best Grammarians both Jews and Christians have confessed, that they know but little on the subject.* We must, therefore, be content with the general rules respecting them; and here, with those only which are found to interfere with the vowels of the text.

122. These accents (Art. 70.) are said to have two offices: one, *Tonic*, that is, having the power to moderate the tone of voice in which any portion of the Scripture is to be read; the other, *Euphonic*, that is, when added, either for the purpose of giving a kind of secondary accent to words, or for the purpose of implying joy, grief, or some other affection of the mind. It seems likely, however, that they are added in a great number of instances, for the mere purpose of filling up the vowel-system, as to perfect or imperfect syllables, and of obviating a great number of anomalies, which must otherwise occur.

On the Tonic Accent.

123. With respect to the Tonic accent, it may be any one of those found in the table (Art. 62.) excepting *Métheg:* and will always be found either *expressed*, or *implied*,† on the penultimate or ultimate syllable of any word. When on the penultimate, the word is said to be מִלְעֵיל *Milʿél:* when on the ultimate, מִלְרַע *Milráh.* The following rules for its insertion are taken from Alting's Hebrew Grammar.

---

* See my reply to Dr. Laurence, entitled, "A Vindication of certain Strictures," &c. Cambridge, 1822, p. 17, &c.

† That is, if the accent be one of those termed *Prepositives* or *Postpositives*, it must be considered as giving emphasis to one or other of these syllables, according to the analogy of the word.

1st, All words, the penultimate vowel of which is imperfect, and not having a consonant immediately following it, will have the Tonic accent on that syllable. Of this kind are all duals and segolate nouns:—the feminine affix דְ (*thy*), attached to dual or plural nouns; as also all nouns having terminations peculiar to the segolate forms: as, יָדַיִם *both hands*, Gen. xxvii. 22; צַיִד *hunting*; כֶּסֶף *silver*; עֵינַיִךְ *thy eyes* (fem.), Cant. i. 15; מַרְאַיִךְ *thy appearances*, Ib. ii. 14; בַּשֶּׂלֶת *a rose*; מְקֻטֶּרֶת *incensed*, Ib. iii. 6, &c.

The reason is obvious, the penultimate syllable is, in all these cases imperfect, the addition of the accent is, therefore, necessary for the purposes of syllabication (Artt. 34. 47.).

Segolate nouns having the penultimate vowel perfect, will, on account of their peculiar character, also retain the accent on that syllable: as, סֵתֶר *concealment*; מָוֶת (for מַוְתְ) *death*; בְּהוּ (for בָּהֳוּ) *emptiness* (See Art. 48. note). Also proper names ending in חוּ: as, צִדְקִיָּהוּ *Zedekiah*.

2dly, Certain nouns receiving a syllabic pronominal affix, having, at the same time, a vowel of union (Art. 130.), or, also having a paragogic וְ *Nún*, will have the accent on the penultimate of the word so formed. (The affixes usually termed grave, i. e. כֶם, כֶן, הֶם, הֶן, are excepted): as, נַפְשֵׁנוּ *our soul*; עָלֶהוּ *its leaf*, Ps. i. 3; תְּחַדֶּהוּ *thou shalt rejoice him*, Ps. xxi. 7; יַחְשְׁבֶהָ *he imputed it*, Gen. xv. 6; פָּנֶיהוּ *his face*, Ps. xi. 7; כְּנָפֶיךָ *thy wings*, Ps. xvii. 8; אוֹכִיחֲךָ *I will rebuke thee*, Ps. l. 8; קְרָאתִיךָ *I have called thee*, Ps. cxix. 146; יוֹדוּךָ *they shall praise thee*, Ps. lxvii. 6; תְּדַכֶּנּוּ *it* (the wind) *shall dispel it*, Ps. i. 4.

This also holds good, when these affixes are attached to the paragogic וְ of plural verbs: as, יְשַׁחֲרֻנְנִי *they shall seek me early*, Prov. i. 28: יְשָׁרְתוּנֶךָ *they shall serve thee*, Isa. lx. 7; יִלְכְּדֻנּוּ *they shall take him*, Prov. v. 22.

3dly, Verbs terminating (i. e. in the process of conjugation) in the afformative syllables תָּ, תִּי, נוּ, and נָה; as, חָפַצְתָּ *thou art willing*, Ps. xl. 7; בִּשַּׂרְתִּי *I have announced* (good tidings), Ib. v. 10; שִׁקַּרְנוּ *we have dealt falsely*, Ps. xliv. 18; תְּבֹאֶינָה *they* (fem.) *shall come*, Ps. xlv. 16.

4thly, Asyllabic afformatives are subject to the same rule, in the conjugation *Hiphḥil*: as, הוֹחִילִי *hope thou* (fem.), Ps. xliii. 5; הוֹשִׁיעָה *it* (fem.) *brought salvation*, Ps. xliv. 4.

Also in the surd and concave verbs: as, לְבוּ *surround ye*, Ps. xlviii. 13; מָטוּ *they move*, Ps. xlvi. 7: likewise when these affixes

are joined to the third person singular of the preterite of verbs: as, שְׁטָפָתְנִי *it* (fem.) *hath overwhelmed me*, Ps. lxix. 3; אֲהֵבְתְךָ *she hath loved thee*, Ruth iv. 15.

5th, When the paragogic ה is added to nouns, pronouns, or particles, it exercises no influence on the accent, for the most part. In such cases, therefore, the accent will be in the penultima: as, אֶפְרָתָה *Ephratah*, Gen. xxxv. 16, &c.

124. The Tonic accent will have its place on the last syllable of words, in the following cases, which are then termed מִלְרַע *Milraḥ*, viz.

1st. All words ending with a consonant preceded by a perfect vowel by analogy: as, גָּדֹל *great*; מָאוֹר *luminary*; בָּנִים *sons*; בָּנוֹת *daughters*. The same is the case when any of the אֶהֱוִי letters are so situated, being considered as consonants: as, שָׁנָה *a year*; מַצֵּבָה *a pillar*: and even ה preceded by (ִ), as, יַהֲיֶה *he is*, &c.

2d, All words ending in one of the grave affixes: as, דִּמְכֶם *your blood*; אֲבִיהֶם *their father*; תִּהְיוּתֶם *ye shall be*, Gen. iii. 5.

3d, All verbs having no afformative syllable: as, לָקַח *he took*; נִקְרָא *he is called*.

4th, All verbs taking the asyllabic afformatives הָ, וּ, and יִ: as, שָׁקְטָה *it is quiet*; פָּקְדוּ *they visited*; סַתְּרִי *hide thyself* (fem.); and, finally, all words not comprehended in any of the preceding rules (Art. 123.).

On certain Anomalies as to the situation of the Accent, and on the changes effected by it on the vowels and consonants of words.

125. This generally takes place, 1st, when the illative particle וְ* is prefixed to verbs, in which case, 1st, the Tonic accent, which is proper for the penultimate vowel in the past tense (Art. 123. 3.), will be removed to the ultimate: and, 2dly, *vice versa*, the accent proper for the ultimate in the present (Art. 124. 1.), will be removed to the penultimate: as, 1st, וְקִדַּשְׁתִּי *so I will consecrate* (for קִדַּשְׁתִּי), Exod. xxix. 44; וְנֶאֱסַפְתָּ *so thou shalt be gathered* (for נֶאֱסַפְתָּ), Numb. xxvii. 13; וְהִבְדִּילָה *so it shall divide*; וְתִבְאָתָּ *thus thou*

---

* Usually termed *Vaw conversivum*, but which seems to correspond with the Arabic ف or ز, *therefore*, &c.

shalt bring, Exod. xxvi. 33; וְרַבָּה *so she shall be multiplied*, Isa. vi. 12; וְשַׂמְתָּ *therefore thou shalt place*, Lev. xxiv. 6; וְשָׁבָה *so she shall return*, Lev. xxii. 13; וְשָׂמוּ *thus they shall place*, Numb. vi. 27; וּבָאתָ *so thou shalt enter*, Gen. vi. 18.

2d, This rule, however, is often disregarded: as, וְלָקַחְנוּ *so we took*, Gen. xxxiv. 17; וְהָלַכְנוּ *and we will depart:* particularly in verbs having a quiescent letter for the third radical; as, וְיָרֵאתָ *and thou shalt fear*, Lev. xix. 32; וְנָלִיתִי *and I will reveal*, 1 Sam. xx. 12; וְנָלִיתָ *and thou shalt go into captivity*, Ezek. xii. 3. With some having the medial radical letter quiescent: as, וְנָסוּתָה *and thou shalt flee*, 2 Kings ix. 3.

3d, In the next place, the accent will be removed from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable of the present tense, when the illative particle וְ is prefixed, and in such cases as the form of the verb will allow of the change: e. g. וַיִּפְקֹד (for יִפְקֹד) *and he is visited.* But in the third person plural masc. it will keep its place: as, וַיִּפְקְדוּ (from יִפְקְדוּ). The same holds good also in the form יִפְקֹד: as, וַיִּפְקֹד *and he visits.*

Corollary. Hence it will follow, that the accent being removed from the last syllable, the ultimate vowel must necessarily become imperfect (Art. 34.): as, וַיִּגַּף *and he was struck* (for יִגָּף); וַיֹּאמֶר (for יֹאמֵר) *and he said;* וַיָּמָת *and he died* (for יָמוֹת or יָמוּת); and so of others.

4th, In the conjugation called *Hiphḥîl*, as it will be seen hereafter, the terminating vowel is either (ִי) or (ֵי). Whenever, therefore, the accent is drawn back, by this, or any other rule, the imperfect vowel will be (ִי) not (ֵי): as, וַיָּקֶם *and he raised* (from יָקֵם or יָקִים). So וַיָּלֶן *and he lodged* (for יָלֵן or יָלִין), Gen. xxviii. 11, Josh. viii. 9; וַיָּנַח *and he rested* (for יָנֵחַ or יָנִיחַ), Exod. x. 14, where (ַ) is taken on account of the guttural letter following.

In one instance, however, we have וַתָּרֶץ (for תָּרֵץ, root רצץ) *and she broke*, Judg. ix. 53.

5th, When, however, the last letter of the root happens to be one of the אֲהֵוִי letters in a state of quiescence, the perfect vowel will occasionally remain: as, וַיָּבֵא *and he brings*, Gen. iv. 3.

6th, In many cases, also, this removal of the accent is altogether neglected: as, וָאֵשֵׁב *and I sit*, 1 Kings viii. 20, &c.

7th, It is in consequence of this removal of the accent, that the terminating vowel of the present tense of verbs is changed (No. 3. above) and, in many instances, entirely rejected with the consonant

following, when that is quiescent: e. g. יִגֶל for יִגְלֶה (Art. 80); and, by 114, יִגֶּל *he causes to reveal*, which is termed *Apocope*.

The reason of this seems to be, that as the terminating vowel was probably introduced originally for the mere sake of Euphony (See Art. 114.), there is no reason why it may not be rejected, upon any change taking place in the form of the word; and, upon the vowel's being rejected, the ה, becoming *otiose* in consequence, may also be omitted (See Art. 80.). This also takes place where the vowel ought by analogy to remain: e. g. וַיְכַל for וַיְכַלֶּה *so he finishes;* נַךְ for וַיַּכֵּה *and he smote.**

But in these verbs also, the accent sometimes keeps its place when ו is so prefixed: as, וַנִּהְיֶה *and we become*, 2 Sam. xi. 23, &c.

8th, Again, the accent is occasionally removed from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable in the present tense and the imperatives of verbs, apparently for the purpose of expressing *prohibition, forbearance, exhortation, wishing*, or the like, with the greater emphasis: as, אַל־תָּשֹׁב *turn not away*, 1 Kings ii. 20 (for תָּשֻׁב); אַל־תּוֹכַח *chastise not*, Prov. ix. 8 (for תּוֹכֵחַ); אַל־תּוֹסֵף *add not*, Prov. xxx. 6 (for תּוֹסֵף, where the vowel of the medial radical is also rejected, though not followed by a quiescent ה †); אַרְוֶךָּ *I will water thee* (for אַרְוֶנְךָּ, the root being ריו, usually רוה, in which case the final radical letter generally returns. In this case the י is doubled, because the verb is in the species of *Pīhél*). So הִשָּׁמֶר *observe* (for הִשָּׁמֵר); תֵּת *give*, &c. Gen. xi. 3, 4 (for תֵּתָה Gen. xxix. 21); תֵּבִי *give thou* (fem.), Ruth iii. 15, &c.

9th, So in verbs having the third radical letter a quiescent ה: as, יִרְדְּ *let him rule* (for יִרְדֶּה); יִמַּח *let him be blotted out* (for יִמָּחֶה), Ps. cix. 13; יַפְתְּ *may he dilate* (for יַפְתֶּה), Gen. ix. 27; יְהִי *let it be* (for יִהְיֶה), Gen. i. 3; אַל־תִּשְׁתְּ *drink not* (for תִּשְׁתֶּה), Lev. x. 9; אַל־יֵרָא *let it not be seen* (for יֵרָאֶה), Exod. xxxiv. 3; אַל־תֶּרֶף *relax not* (for תַּרְפֶּה; where the verb takes the form of a segolate noun, see Art. 114); אַל־תְּהִי *be not* (for תִּהְיֶה); and so of others. But it may here be remarked, as before, that the regular form of the verb, as well as the position of the accent, is often adopted: as,

---

* This, in addition to considerations hereafter to be mentioned, induces me to believe, that the ground-form of the present tense, is really one of the abstract nouns termed segolate.

† Because, as before (No. 7.), it was perhaps merely Euphonic.

אַל־אֶרְאֶה *lest I should see*, Gen. xxi. 16; אַל־יִרְאֶה *lest he should see*, Job iii. 9.

10th, Examples of imperatives subject to Apocope: גַּל *reveal thou* (for גַּלֵּה in *Pīhél*); הַךְ *smite thou* (for הַכֵּה), Amos ix. 1; הֶרֶב *multiply thou* (for הַרְבֵּה in *Hiphhíl*. Here the form assumed is that of a segolate noun, the first vowel becoming (ֶ), in order to accommodate itself to the sound of the second, Art. 114.), Ps. li. 4. So הַעַל * *cause thou to ascend* (for הַעֲלֵה), Exod. xxxiii. 12; הִתְחַל *feign thyself* (to be) *sick* (for הִתְחַלֵּה), 2 Sam. xiii. 5.

11th, It frequently happens in verbs ending with a radical ה (for י), when receiving any asyllabic augment, that not only is the accent drawn back, as in the cases above mentioned (No. 8.), but the original radical letter also appears: as, חָסְתָה *it* (fem.) *hath trusted* (for חָסְתָּה, according to the general paradigma, from the root חָסָה for חָסִי), Ps. lvii. 2. So יְשָׁלְיוּ *they are tranquil* (for יְשָׁלוּ, root שָׁלָה or שָׁלַי, whence regularly יְשָׁלְיוּ), Ps. cxxxi. 6, &c.; יֶאֱתָיוּ *let them come* (for יָאֶתוּ, root אָתָה or אָתַי), Ps. lxviii. 32; הֵתָיוּ *bring ye* (for הַאתוּ, Art. 78.), Jer. xii. 9.

126. In a few instances this drawing back of the accent also takes place in nouns and particles: as, רַבָּתִי עָם *numerous art thou* (in) *people* (for רַבָּתְּ). So רַבָּתִי בַגּוֹיִם *great art thou among the nations*; שָׂרָתִי בַּמְּדִינוֹת *a princess art thou among the provinces*, Lam. i. 1. In like manner we have לָמָּה, לָמֶּה, or לָפָּה *why?* (for לָמָּה, לָמֶּה, or לַפָּה), where, according to Schrœderus,—"subest adfectus exprobrantis, vel conquerentis, vel alius similis." To these he adds, אָנִי *I* (for אֲנִי), Ezek. xvii. 16, 22.

127. Again, the accent will be withdrawn from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable, in order to avoid the concurrence of two *Tonic accents*; which would be the case when the following word happens to be a monosyllable having an accent, or a dissyllable with an accent on the penultima. But in this case, the penultimate vowel of the former of such two words, will be perfect: as, פָּתַח צוּר *he opened the rock* (for פְּתַח), Ps. cv. 41; אֵלֵךְ לִי *I will betake me*, Cant. iv. 6; הֲהֻיְתָה זֹאת *has this come to pass?* (for הֲהָיְתָה) Joel i. 2; אֲחוֹתִי הִיא *she* (is) *my sister*, Gen. xx. 2; וְנָתַן לְךָ *and he will give thee*, Deut. xix. 8; עָגֵל מְאֹד *he will exult exceedingly*, Ps. xxi. 2.

---

* These Imperatives are probably nothing more than primitive abstract nouns, termed Segolates, enounced with some energy.

2d, When verbs receiving any asyllabic augment have, on that account, rejected any of their primitive vowels, they will upon the removal of the accent, by the above mentioned rule, restore such rejected vowel: as, תְּתָהֻתְלוּ בוֹ *ye shall delude him* (for תְּתַהְתְּלוּ), Job xiii. 9; גֻּשׁוּ הֵנָּה *come hither* (for גְּשׁוּ), Josh. iii. 9; תְּאֻהֲבוּן רִיק *ye will love vanity* (for תְּאֶהֱבוּן), Ps. iv. 3; חָסָיוּ בוֹ *they trusted in him* (for חָסְיוּ regularly, but חָסוּ according to the tables for these verbs).

3d, Should, however, this drawing back of the accent with the consequent change of the ultimate vowel tend to destroy or obscure the original form and signification of the word, no such change will take place: as, תַּעֲלֻמוֹת לֵב *the hidden things of the heart* (not תַּעֲלָמֹת with *Kāmétz Khātúph*); עֹבֵר יָם *passing over the sea* (not עֹבֶר).

4th, The accent will frequently fall on the penultimate, instead of the ultimate, syllable in words which conclude a sentence, or a member of a sentence.

These accents are, for the most part, *Sillúk*, *Athnákh*; and, in the poetical books, *Mercá* with *Mahpák* (Art. 62.).

In many of these cases, the removal of the accent will occasion no change whatever in the vowels: as, נוֹשָׁבָה (for נוֹשָׁבָה) *inhabited*, Jer. vi. 8; עָרוּ (for עָרוּ) *make bare*, Ps. cxxxvii. 7; כָּלוּ (for כָּלוּ) they *are consumed*, Ps. xxxvii. 20, &c.

But, in those persons of the verb which are formed by some asyllabic augment, or have the paragogic ה, and where the second vowel of the root has been rejected, the accent, taking that syllable, will restore such vowel: as, קָרְבָה (for קָרֵבָה, from the root קָרַב) *she hath approached*, Zeph. iii. 2; יָכְלוּ (for יָכֵלוּ, root יָכֹל) *they were able*, 2 Kings iii. 26; תִּשְׁמְרוּ (for תִּשְׁמֹרוּ, root, i. e. form for the Pres., שָׁמֹר) *ye shall keep*, Exod. xxxi. 13. So אֵלְכָה (from אֵלֵךְ) *I will walk*, Gen. xxx. 26; סַפְּרוּ (from סַפֵּר) *recount ye*, Joel i. 3; לְכִי (for לֵכִי, from לֵךְ) *go thou*, fem., &c.

5th, When the original final vowel is (-) it generally becomes (ָ) when thus accompanying the accent: as, הָלְכָה *she departed* (from the root הָלֵךְ), Is. xlvi. 2. So נִלְקָחָה (from נִלְקַח) *it was taken*, 1 Sam. iv. 17; וָאִישָׁנָה (from אִישַׁן) *and I sleep*, Ps. iii. 6; נִדְעָה (from נִדַּע) *let us know*, Is. v. 19; צָעֲקִי (from צָעַק) *cry thou* (fem.), Jer. xxii. 20; תְּמָהוּ (from תָּמַהּ), Is. xxix. 9.

6th, But, when a paragogic וֹ follows the asyllabic augments הִ or ־ִי, the accent usually retains its proper situation, while the second vowel of the root is restored as in the last article: as, יִלְקְטוּן (from יִלְקֹט)

they will collect; יִבָּהֲלוּן (from יִבָּהֵל) *they will be confounded;* וְנֶעֱוֹן (from וְנֶעַע) *they will expire,* Ps. civ. 28, 29.

128. Segolate nouns of the form פְּקֹד, derived from roots having for the third radical letter a quiescent ה, will, upon taking the pause accent in the penultimate, restore the original vowel to the first radical: as, חֵצִי (for חֲצִי, from the primitive form חִצְיָ) *the half,* 1 Kings x. 7; מֶרִי (for מְרִי from מִרְיָ) *rebellion,* Ezek. ii. 8; יְפִי (for יָפְיָ, from יֹפִי) *beauty,* Is. iii. 24.

129. Apocopated present tenses of verbs having יֶ in the place of the third radical letter ה, take (ֶ) for the vowel of the personal præformative, when so circumstanced as to receive the accent proper for the pause on that syllable: as, וַיֶּהִי (for וַיֶּהְיִי, from יִהְיֶה), Psalm xxxiii. 9; וַתֶּהִי *and she was,* Lam. iii. 37. So יֶחִי *he shall live* (for יִחְיֶה), Is. xxxviii. 21.

130. When any word having the affixed pronoun ךָ happens to be the last word of a sentence, &c. so that the accent proper for the pause fall upon its penultimate vowel, two methods have been invented for the purpose of avoiding any disagreeable concurrence which may happen in the vowels.

1st, Instead of (ִ) which is proper for affixing this pronoun, as will be seen hereafter, (ֶ) is introduced as *the vowel of union:* as, דְּבָרֶךָ (for דִּבָּרְךָ) *thy word,* Gen. xlvii. 30; נַחֲלָתֶךָ for נַחֲלָתְךָ *thy inheritance,* Ps. ii. 8; יְשָׁעֶךָ (for יִשְׁעֲךָ) *thy salvation,* Ps. li. 14; שְׁמֶךָ (for שִׁמְךָ) *thy name,* Ps. cxxxviii. 2, &c.

2d, The vowel proper for the pronoun is occasionally transposed: as, הַשְׁמְדָךְ (for הַשְׁמֵדְךָ) *thy destruction,* Deut. xxviii. 24; פְּאֵרָךְ (for פְּאֶרְךָ) *he hath adorned thee,* Is. lv. 5; צִוָּךְ (for צִוְּךָ) *he hath commanded thee,* 1 Sam. xiii. 13.

3d, The particles אֵת, עִם, בְּ, and לְ, having ךָ affixed to them and receiving a pause-accent, are always subject to this rule: אִתָּךְ *thee,* Deut. xxviii. 48; אִתָּךְ *with thee,* Gen. viii. 17; עִמָּךְ *with thee,* Gen. xxix. 25; בָּךְ *in thee,* Ps. ix. 3; לָךְ *to, for,* or, *of, thee,* Exod. xxxii. 34, &c. for אֹתְךָ, אִתְּךָ, עִמְּךָ, בְּךָ, לְךָ, &c.

4th, Sometimes ךָ is subject to this rule, when not in the situation for receiving a pause-accent: as, עָנָךְ *he answered thee,* Jer. xxiii. 37; for עָנְךָ.

5th, When a pause-accent falls on an ultimate or penultimate (-) *Páthakh,* or on a penultimate (ֶ) *Segol,* in segolate nouns, that vowel, for the most part, is changed into (ָ) *Kāmétz:* as, עָמָד for עָמַד *he*

hath stood; יָשָׁב for יָשַׁב *he hath sat,* Ps. i. 1, &c.; לָיְלָה for לַיְלָה *night,* Gen. i. 5; חָרֶב for חֶרֶב *a sword,* Josh. viii. 25; עָמְדָת for עַמְדָת *standing,* Eccl. i. 4.

6th, There are, however, certain exceptions: as, וַיִּצְחָק* *he laughed,* Gen. xvii. 17; עֵד *prey,* Ib. xlix. 27; יִצָּתוּ *they shall be set on fire,* Is. xxxiii. 12; דִּבַּרְתָּ *thou hast spoken,* Ib. xxxix. 8; בֶּטַח *security,* Prov. i. 33; אֹמֶנֶת *a nurse,* Ruth. iv. 16.

7th, The pause-accent will sometimes change a terminating (֫) into (֬): as, יֵלֵךְ for יֵלֵךְ֫ *he shall go,* Job xxvii. 21; הָשֵׁב *return, restore,* for הָשֵׁב֫, Is. xlii. 22; אַל־תָּלֶן (for תָּלֶן֫) *tarry not all night,* Jud. xix. 20.

131. *Makkáph,* following a terminating perfect and mutable vowel which precedes a consonant, will change the vowel into its correspondent imperfect one: as, זְכַר־נָא (for זָכַר נָא) *remember now;* כָּל־מְלָכִים (for כָּל מְלָכִים) *all kings;* אֶת־הָעָם (for אֵת הָעָם) *the people,* &c.

2d, But if such final vowel be immutable, no change will take place: as, לְאִישׁ־אַחֵר *to,* or, *for, another man,* Jer. iii. 1; אוֹת־הַבְּרִית *the sign of the covenant,* Gen. ix. 12. The reason of this is; the addition of *Makkáph* deprives the word to which it is attached of its tonic-accent, which makes it necessary that the preceding vowel be imperfect, when that is possible (Art. 34.).

On the Use and Situation of the Euphonic Accent.

132. It has already been remarked, that the *Euphonic accent, Métheg,* may be considered as supplying a secondary emphasis (Art. 74, &c.), with reference to some tonic-accent preceding it. Monosyllables, therefore, can never have an Euphonic accent, unless, indeed, they precede *Makkáph,* but then they are considered as making an integral part of a compound word, and in that case they may receive the Euphonic accent, according to rules presently to be laid down. Dissyllables may receive an Euphonic accent; but these syllables must have a (ְ) *Shevá* intervening: as, יִהְיֶה *he shall be,* &c.

Rules for the Insertion of the Euphonic Accent.

133. The third syllable of any word not ending with a consonant, reckoning inclusively from any tonic-accent, will have the Euphonic

---

* In some editions יִצְחָק.

accent *Métheg:* as, הָאֶחָד *the one*, Gen. ii. 11; הַהֹלֵךְ *which proceedeth*, Ib. v. 14; אִירָשֶׁנָּה *I shall possess it*, Ib. xv. 8; מֵאָבִינוּ *from our Father*, Ib. xix. 32; לִלְשֹׁנֹתָם *according to their tongues*, Ib. x. 20; וּמִמּוֹלַדְתְּךָ *and from thy kindred*, Ib. xii. 1.

134. But, if the third syllable end in a consonant, the Euphonic accent will accompany the fourth: as, וּמֵחֶלְבֵּהֶן *and of their fat*, Gen. iv. 4; וָאֶוָּתֵר *and I remain*, 1 Kings xix. 10; (where ו, being doubled by *Dāgésh*, will conclude the syllable; as, וָאִוָּתֵר).

2d, Perfect vowels preceding *Shĕvá*, and having no tonic accent, will, if occupying the third place from any tonic accent, (reckoning the *Shĕvá*), receive an euphonic one: as, הָיְתָה *it was*, Gen. i. 2; תֵּלְדִי *thou* (fem.) *shalt bring forth*, Ib. iii. 16; נִינְוֵה *Nineveh*, Ib. x. 11; תּוֹלְדוֹת *generations*, Ib. ii. 4; יְשׁוּפְךָ *he shall bruise thee*, Ib. iii. 15.

3d, In many instances the Euphonic accent is omitted; nor is it necessary it should ever be added, if we except one case, viz. when the figure of (ר) *Kāmétz* precedes *Shĕvá*; for then this vowel will be either *ā* or *o*, just as the accent is added or not: as, חָכְמָה *she was wise;* or, חָכְמָה *wisdom* (Art. 58.). In every other case, no difficulty can arise, whether the accent is added or not.

4th, In some cases, however, the Euphonic accent is said to mark the substitution of an imperfect for a perfect vowel: as, גְּבֶלְךָ (for גְּבוּלְךָ *thy border*, Exod. xxiii. 31; וְיִרְאוּ (for וְיִרָאוּ) *and they shall fear*, Mic. vii. 17; where it is necessary for the completion of the syllable (Art. 34.). It is, nevertheless, frequently omitted, and must be supplied by the reader, particularly before an *implied Dāgésh* (Art. 115, &c.), an initial (:), and in some other places.

5th, The letter ו with *Shūrék*, when prefixed to a word, and similarly situated with respect to the tonic accent, will sometimes be found with the Euphonic accent, and then followed by one of the substitutes of *Shĕvá:* as, וְשִׁבְתָּ *and lead thou captive*, Jud. v. 12; וְתִבָּקְשִׁי *and be thou sought*, Ezek. xxvi. 21.

135. Words consisting of more than two syllables, the first of which is terminated by *Dāgésh*, will receive the Euphonic accent on that syllable: as, וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ *and they heard*, Gen. iii. 8; מִמָּחֳרַת *on the morrow*, Ib. xix. 34; הַמַּאֲכֶלֶת *the knife*, Ib. xxii. 6.*

---

* The Student must not be surprised, if he finds the different editions of the Bible vary on these points.

2d, This will also hold good when the *Dāgésh* is omitted: as, וַיִּמְשְׁחֵהוּ *and he felt him*, Ib. xxvii. 22; הַמְכַסֶּה *which covereth*, Exod. xxix. 13, &c. In all these cases *Shĕvá* is initial; and, consequently, any one of the letters בְּגַדְכְּפָת, which may happen to follow, will retain their aspiration: as, תַּמְתַּעֲבִים *the abhorrers*, Mic. iii. 9. Hence הַלְלוּ is to be pronounced *Hālelú*, not *Hallú*. Something of the some kind is observable in the words גִּבְלָהּ and וְיִרְאוּ just cited (Art. 135. 4.).

136. When any one of the substitutes of *Shĕvá* is preceded by a vowel, that vowel will receive the Euphonic accent: as, נַעֲשֶׂה *let us make*, Gen. i. 26; נֶאֱמָן *faithful*, Numb. xii. 7; אָהֳלוֹ *his tent*, Gen. xiii. 3; הָאֲדָמָה *the ground*, Ib. i. 25; צֹעֲקִים *crying out* (pl.), Ib. iv. 10; וְאֲשַׁלְּחֲךָ *and I would have dismissed thee*, Ib. xxxi. 27.

2d, When the substitute of *Shĕvá*, moreover, is resolved into its homogeneous imperfect vowel (Art. 112. 2.), the Euphonic accent will still remain: as, נַעֲלֶךָ *thy sandal*, Isa. xx. 2; וְיֶחֶרְדוּ *and they shall fear*, Hos. xi. 10.

137. When either (֫) *Páthakh*, (֬) *Imperfect Khīrík*, or (֪), precedes (ְ) *Shĕvá*, which is not accompanied by *Dāgésh forte*, it will, for the most part, have the Euphonic accent: as, מַחְבַּרְתּוֹ *its coupling*, Exod. xxxix. 20; הִשְׁתַּחֲוִי *they bowed themselves down*, Jer. viii. 2; יִתְפָּרְקוּ *they broke off*, Exod. xxxii. 3; מִתְיַהֲדִים *becoming Jews*, Esth. viii. 17. Hence we have יְהִיֶה, יְהִיֶה, תְּהִיֶה, יְהִיֶה, תְּהִיֶה, &c., from the verbs הָיָה *become*, and חָיָה *live*. Hence, also, we have the double and triple accentuation of certain words, when one or more *Méthegs* happen to be introduced by the operation of one or more of the preceding rules: as, בְּמַחֲנֵהּ *in the camp*, Exod. xxxvi. 6, &c. as in several of the instances already adduced. But, in most of these cases, the accents do not interfere with the syllabication (See Art. 48.).

2d, This Euphonic accent is sometimes found with an initial *Shĕvá*: as, שְׂאוּ *take up*, Ps. lxxxi. 3.

138. On some occasions, other accents are found to occupy the situation of *Métheg*. These are, ֒ *Mūnákh*, ֔ *Kadmá*, ֕ *Mercá*: as, וַעֲצֵי *and the pieces of wood*, Gen. xxii. 7; וְאַהֲרֹן *and Aaron*, Exod. vii. 7; וְהַכֹּהֵן *and the priest*, Levit. vii. 8; לְמַלְכִּיאֵל *of Malchiel*, Numb. xxvi. 45. In these cases we have *Mūnákh* or *Kadmá* in the place of *Métheg*, followed by *Zāképh Kātón*. In וַיֵּלְכוּ *and they proceeded*, Numb. xxii. 7, *Kadmá* is followed by *Géresh*; and,

Ib. xxxii. 39, we have it again, coupled with *Methég*, in some editions: as, וַיֵּלְכוּ, which, with many similar examples, is perhaps to be ascribed to the carelessness or hurry of the copyists.

2d, In the following examples we have *Mercá* ֫ in the place of *Methég*: as, כְּכֹכְבֵי *like the stars*,* Exod. xxxii. 13; וַיִּטְמְנֵהוּ *and he hid him*, Exod. ii. 12.† In these cases *Mercá* is found with *Tiphkhá* for its tonic accent.

3d, In a few instances *Yérakh* ֪ or *Yĕthív* ֢ is found in the place of *Métheg*; as, מִמִּזְעֲצֹתֵיהֶם *from their counsels*, Ps. v. 11; שֶׁאֲהֵבָה *whom it* (fem.) *loves*, Cant. i. 7. In the last case, however, שֶׁ is considered as standing for אֲשֶׁר, and may therefore take any tonic accent.

This contains the substance of the rules given by Buxtorf in his Thesaurus Grammaticus, which have appeared to me to be the best hitherto given.—In numerous cases, as the student will find, many of these rules are never applied; and, in many others, as already remarked, the printed copies of the Hebrew Bible differ, as do also the MSS. In many instances, neither the syllabication nor the sense of the passage, is affected by these accents, whence it should seem probable that they have been added merely for the purpose of regulating the tone of voice in reading or chanting the text.

On the Use and Position of Makkaph.

139. Learned men are not agreed, whether this mark is to be ranked among the accents or not. Some have argued that it ought, because it is always found to supply the place of an accent. Others have contended, that it ought not; because it is universally found to deprive the word, to which it is attached, of its tone-accent. That it has been made equivalent to an accent, I think, both parties allow: and, if I mistake not, its depriving the word, to which it has been attached, of its tone-accent, seems to make for the hypothesis, that it ought to be considered as performing the functions of such accent. It seems to me, therefore, but a loss of time to argue against its being *termed* an accent.

Rules for its Use and Insertion.

140. Words, immediately connected with each other, either in sig-

---

* In some editions כְּכוֹכְבֵי regularly.

† Which is also with *Métheg* in some editions.

nification, or by grammatical construction, are frequently connected by *Makkáph*, the former being then deprived of its tone-accent: as, נְאֻם־יְהוָה *Jehovah's word*, Amos ii. 16; טְהָר־לֵב *pure of heart*, Prov. xxii. 11; וַיֵּט־שָׁם *and he pitched* (his tent) *there*; בֶּן־מְעַט *a little son*, 2 Sam. ix. 12; בֶּן־אֶחָד *one son*, 1 Sam. xxii. 20; כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ *every high thing*, Job xli. 26; וְגִבְּלוֹ־אֹתוֹ *it shall limit it*, Josh. xviii. 20; גַּם־לְאִישָׁהּ *even to her husband*, Gen. iii. 6; פֶּן־תְּדַבֵּר עִם־יַעֲקֹב מִטּוֹב עַד־רָע *lest thou speak with Jacob* (any thing) *from good to bad*, Gen. xxxi. 24; אֲשֶׁר־קָרָא *which he called*, Gen. xxvi. 18. So, גַּן־בְּעֵדֶן *a garden in Eden*, Gen. ii. 8; גְּשׁ־הָלְאָה *come hither*, Ib. xix. 9; בָּא־לָגוּר *he came to sojourn*, Ib.; וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב *and the evening was*, Ib. i. 5, &c., to which many others might be added, in which two, three, or even four words, are thus connected (see Art. 74.). In all these cases, the last word only in the connection will have the tone-accent.

2d, Since, then, the tone-accent is in all these cases taken away, words so connected, ending in a perfect mutable vowel, and followed by a consonant, will generally take the correspondent imperfect one in that syllable: as, כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ *every high thing*, instead of כל גָּבֹהַּ; גְּשׁ־הָלְאָה *come hither*, for גֶּשׁ הָלְאָה; זְכָר־נָּא *remember, pray*, Isa. xxxviii. 3, for זְכֹר נָא; שְׁמָר־תָּם *preserve integrity*, Psalm xxxvii. 37, for שְׁמֹר תָּם (Art. 131.).

3d, In the following and similar cases, the terminating vowel of the preceding word is immutable: as, בְּנוֹת־לוֹט *the daughters of Lot*, Gen. xix. 36; גִּבֹּר־צַיִד *great* (in) *hunting*, Gen. x. 9; וְגִבְּלוֹ־אֹתוֹ *it* (the Jordan) *shall limit it*; לְבַ־דָוִד *David's heart*, 2 Sam. xxiv. 10, where לְבַ is put for לֵבָב; תֵּת־כֹּחַ *the giving of its* (fem.) *strength*, Gen. iv. 12, תֵּת being put for תְּנֶת.

4th, We have, however, Prov. xxii. 15, בְּלֶב־נָעַר *in the heart of a child*. We also have, Gen. xvi. 13, שֹׁם־יְהוָה, and, Ib. 15, שֵׁם־בְּנוֹ, which, with similar instances, may perhaps be referred to the carelessness of the copyists.*

141. *Makkáph* is found to be inserted in the following cases:

1st, Particles, which, from their characters, can never have a *distinctive* accent, are mostly connected with other words by the mark *Makkáph*: as, גַּם־לְאִישָׁהּ *even to her husband*; בְּתֹם־לְבָבִי *in the integrity of my heart*, Gen. xx. 5, &c.

---

* The most complete list of these exceptions is given in the second volume of the Heb. Gram. by Guarin, pp. 320—1, 2.

2d, When words are to be construed together, the tone-accents of which would concur; i. e. when the accent of the preceding word is on the last syllable, and the following word is either a monosyllable, or a dissyllable having the accent on the penultimate, then, in order to avoid such concurrence (Art. 127.), such words are to be connected by *Makkáph;* as, זַרְעוֹ־בוֹ *its seed* (is) *within itself*, Gen. i. 11, instead of זַרְעוֹ בוֹ. So וַיְחַבְּקֵ֥הוּ וַיְנַשְּׁקֵ֖הוּ *so he embraced him, and kissed him*, Ib. xxix. 13, instead of וַיְנַשֶּׁק לוֹ, &c.; וַיְהִי־עֶ֖רֶב וַיְהִי־בֹֽקֶר *and evening was, and morning was*, Ib. i. 5, instead of וַיְהִי עֶרֶב, &c. The remaining rules usually given by the grammarians may be resolved into one or other of the preceding.

3d, In any of the above cases, the Euphonic accent may be appended to the former of such words, according to the rules already laid down, (Art. 134, &c.)

LECTURE V.

ON THE CHANGES WHICH TAKE PLACE IN THE TERMINATIONS OF WORDS, IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE FORMATION OF THE FEMININE, FROM THE MASCULINE, GENDER; THE DUAL OR PLURAL, FROM THE SINGULAR NUMBER; AND THE STATE OF DEFINITE CONSTRUCTION.

Of the Formation of the Feminine, from the Masculine, Gender.

142. It should be premised, that in the Hebrew Language there are but two genders, viz. the Masculine, and the Feminine.

1st, The Masculine is generally restricted to nouns signifying the proper names and offices of men: as, דָּוִד *David;* עֻזָּה *Uzza;* פֶּחָה or פֶּחַת *a governor;* קֹהֶלֶת *a preacher,* &c. whatever be their termination.

2d,—To all words signifying *People, Rivers, Mountains,* or *Months:* as, יִשְׂרָאֵל *Israel;* יַרְדֵּן *Jordan;* סִינַי *Sinai;* נִיסָן *Nīsán,* &c. without reference to their termination.

3d, All words ending in any radical letter (not included in No. 5.), also those ending in a servile ה preceded by (◦), and others terminating in י, ם, or ן, servile, will be of the masculine gender: as, דָּבָר *a word;* מִמְשָׁל *dominion;* שְׁדֵה *a plain,* or *field;* מַרְאֵה *vision;* עִבְרִי *a Hebrew;* פְּדְיוֹם *redemption;* שֻׁלְחָן *a table;* קָרְבָּן *an offering.**

---

* The exceptions are: אֶבֶן *a stone;* אַגָּן *a bowl;* אֶפְעֶה *a viper;* אַשְׁוּר or אַשּׁוּר *a step, pace;* בְּאֵר *a well;* גֹּרֶן *a corn-floor;* חֶרֶב *a sword;* יָתֵד *a stake, post;* כַּד a vessel so called; כּוֹס *a full cup;* כִּכָּר *a talent;* מַחֲבַת *a frying-pan;* נֹגַהּ *light;* נַעַל *a sandal;* סֹלֶת *flour;* עָב *a cloud;* עַיִשׁ *a star* so called; עֶרֶשׂ *a bed;* פַּת *a morsel;* צָפוֹן *the north;* שְׂלָו *a quail;* תֵּבֵל *the world;* חֲמוֹר *an ass;* לֶחֶם *bread;* מָגֵן *a shield;* עֶרֶב *the evening,* which are all feminine.

4th, Feminine nouns are, either the proper names of women, or words designating their offices: likewise, the names of *regions, cities,* or nouns signifying the parts, and double members of the body, whatever be their terminating letters; e. g. רָחֵל *Rākhél;* מִיכָל *Mīkál;* שֵׁגָל *a consort;* מוֹאָב *Mōáb;* אֱדוֹם *Ĕdóm;* חֶבְרוֹן *Khebrón;* יְרוּשָׁלַיִם *Yĕrūshāláim;* בֶּטֶן *the belly;* אֹזֶן *the ear,* &c. This distinction, therefore, arises from the signification, not from the form, of the word: cities and regions being considered perhaps as mothers, and so of others.

5th, Nouns ending in ־ָה or ת servile are also of the feminine gender: as, פּוֹקֵדָה or פּוֹקֶדֶת *a female visitor;* בְּהֵמָה *a beast;* מַמְלֶכֶת or מַלְכוּת *a kingdom.* So שֵׁנָא for שֵׁנָה *sleep,* &c.*

6th, Many nouns are found used in both genders, which are, therefore, termed *common.* These generally are, 1, The names of *animals, flocks, birds:* 2, Segolate nouns not restricted to the names or offices of men: and, 3, Others designating parts of the human body: 4, Participial nouns of the form פָּקֵד: and, 5, The decimal numerals from twenty to one hundred, inclusive: e. g. 1, גָּמָל *a camel;* דֹּב *a bear;* צֹאן and שֶׂה *a flock of sheep;* צִפּוֹר *a bird:* 2, אֹרַח *a road;* רוּחַ *the spirit:* 3, יָד *the hand;* עַיִן *the eye;* זְרוֹעַ *the arm;* נֶפֶשׁ *the*

---

* The exceptions are, פֶּה *the mouth;* צַוָּאר *the neck;* עֶרֶף *the back;* שֹׁר or שָׁרֵר *the navel;* עַפְעַפִּים *the eyelids;* עָקֵב *the heel;* דְּמוּת *likeness;* שְׁדֵמָה *a blasted field;* מִנְחָה *a meat-offering;* מוֹרָה *a razor;* מִקְשָׁה *a cucumber bed;* and צָבָא *an army,* which are all masculine. I am inclined to believe, that this termination is nothing more than a fragment of some ancient form of the feminine pronoun of the third person singular, which we also find as the inseparable feminine pronoun of the same person. See the table of nseparable pronouns, Art. 153.

soul: 4, חָצֵר *an enclosure:* 5, עֶשְׂרִים *twenty;* שְׁלֹשִׁים *thirty,* &c. To these several others of different forms may be added: as, אָרוֹן *a chest,* or *ark;* גַּן *a garden;* חַלּוֹן *a window;* יָצִיעַ *a couch;* יוֹבֵל *a jubilee,* &c. which will be found in the dictionaries.

143. We now come to shew how the noun of the feminine gender is formed from that of the masculine.

1st, It will readily be perceived, that the names of certain offices, &c. may apply to either men or women, and that cases might occur in which it may be necessary to designate the sex of the person to which such word may be applied. The masculine forms have already been pointed out; it will be necessary here to shew how those peculiar to the feminine are formed from them.

2d, Feminine nouns will be formed from masculine ones merely by adding the termination ־ָה or ־ָת, and changing the preceding vowels of the ultimate or penultimate syllable according to the analogy of the word (hereafter to be considered) and the rules detailed (Artt. 98. 99. &c.); e. g. טוֹב *a good man,* &c.; טוֹבָה *a good woman,* &c.; מֶלֶךְ (original form מַלְכְּ) *a king,* מַלְכָּה *a queen;* פּוֹקֵד masc. פּוֹקֶדֶת or פּוֹקְדָה fem. *a visitor,* or *visiting.*

3d, Let us now see in what instances these different terminations are used. It will be extremely difficult to lay down rules which will comprehend every possible case. We shall content ourselves with the following, given by Albert Schultens.

4th, Nouns ending in a perfect *immutable* vowel will generally take the termination ־ָה: as, פָּקוּד *visited,* masc.; פְּקוּדָה fem.; טוֹב *good,* masc.; טוֹבָה fem.; גָּדוֹל *great,* masc.; גְּדוֹלָה fem.; צַדִּיק *just,* masc.; צַדִּיקָה fem.

5th, Patronymics, and nouns originally ending in י: also ordinal numbers ending in י and falling under this rule,

will double the (י) by *Dāgésh*, upon receiving this feminine termination: as, מוֹאָבִי *a Moabite;* מוֹאֲבִיָּה (or מוֹאָבִית) *a Moabitess.* So, אֲרַמִּי *a Syrian;* fem. אֲרַמִּיָּה (or אֲרַמִּית); פּוֹרֶה *bearing fruit;* בּוֹכִיָּה *weeping;* שְׁלִישִׁי *the third,* masc.; שְׁלִישִׁיָּה or שְׁלִישִׁית, fem.

6th, Participles of the *Hiphhil* conjugation are excepted: as, מַפְקִיד fem.; מַפְקֶדֶת, with some other nouns: as, שַׁלִּיט *a ruler;* שַׁלֶּטֶת fem.; גְּבִיר *a master;* גְּבִירָה or גְּבֶרֶת *a mistress.*

7th, Nouns receiving a quiescent *Shēvá* (:) in the penultimate syllable will take ־ָה for their feminine termination: as, אָדוֹם *red,* masc.; אֲדֻמָּה (for אֲדֻמְמָה) fem.; קָטָן *little,* masc.; קְטַנָּה, fem.; סָבִב *surrounded,* masc.; סְבִבָה, fem. So, נִגְלָה *revealed,* for נִגְלֵתָה, from נִגְלֶה, masc. by contraction (Art. 78.).

8th, Hence all segolate nouns will form their feminines in ־ָה; as, מֶלֶךְ, for מַלְכָה *a king,* fem.; מַלְכָה *a queen;* אֹכֶל for אָכְלָה *food,* fem. אָכְלָה; עָוֶל for עַוְלָה *wickedness,* fem. עַוְלָה; or, by contraction (Art. 92.), עוֹלָה; צַיִד, for צַיְדָה contracted by (Art. 92. 3.) צַיִד *hunting,* fem. צֵידָה.

9th, Some nouns are found to take both forms of the feminine: as, מַמְלָכָה or מַמְלֶכֶת *a kingdom;* מִשְׁפָּחָה or מִשְׁפַּחַת *a family,* (*Pāthákhs* are here taken instead of *Sēgóls* on account of the guttural ח) אַשְׁמוּרָה or אַשְׁמֶרֶת *a watch* or *guard.* So some participles and infinitives: as, פּוֹקְדָה or פּוֹקֶדֶת *visiting,* fem.; לֵדָה or לֶדֶת *bringing forth.* To which may be added the patronymics, &c. above noticed, as well as many other nouns, which will be learned best from practice.

144. Nouns not subject to these restrictions will, for the most part, have their feminine forms ending in ־ֶת or in some equivalent termination: as, עָטָר *a crown;* עֲטָרֶת, fem. (which also has עֲטָרָה).

2. The terminations equivalent to ־ֶת are: 1, ־וֹת: 2, ־וּת: 3, ־וֹת: 4, ־אֵת: 5, ־אַת: 6, ־ֵת or ־ֶת: 7, ־ָת or ־ָת: as, 1, אָחוֹת *sister,* for אַחֲוֶת; but, on account of the guttural ח, אַחֲוֶת, which, by Art. 93. will become אַחוֹת or אָחוֹת: 2, גָּלוּת for גָּלוֹת,

and by Art. 93. 2. גָּלוּת *exile*: 3, תַּבְנִית *a pattern*, for תַּבְנִיֶת, and by Art. 93. 4. תַּבְנִית: 4, מוֹצֵאת for מוֹצֶאת *finding*, by Art. 93. 5. 5, חַטָּאת for חַטַּאת *sin* (by the same Article); 6, תֵּת for תֶּנֶת *giving*, (primitive form תִּנְתְּ the נ being rejected by Art. 82.). So, אֵמֶת *truth*, for אֱמֶנֶת or אֱמֶנְתְּ: 7, לֶת for לֶדֶת *bringing forth a child*, (primitive form לִדְתְּ, and, rejecting the medial ד for the sake of euphony, we have לֶת). For the same reason, we have אַחַת for אַחַדְתְּ *one*, fem.; בַּת *a daughter*, for בַּנְתְּ or בִּנְתְּ: זִמְרַת *a song*, has the regular Chaldaic or Syriac termination.

On the Inflection of Nouns.

145. There are three numbers recognised by Hebrew Grammarians in the inflection of nouns: viz. the Singular, the Dual, and the Plural.

On the Formation of the Dual Number.

146. The dual number is formed from the singular by adding the termination ־ַיִם: as, יוֹם *a day*; יוֹמַיִם *two days*; מֶלֶךְ (for מַלְךְ) *a king*; מַלְכִים *two kings*; מַלְכָּה *a queen*; מַלְכָתַיִם *two queens*. Instead of שְׁנַיִם *two*, we have, by contraction (Art. 93. 3.), שְׁנֵים, and fem. for שְׁתַּיִם, שְׁתֵּים (for שְׁנָתַיִם Art. 82.), by the same rule.

2. Note. All feminine nouns ending in ־ָה, change ה to ת upon receiving any increment whatsoever; as also when put in construction with any other noun, of which more will be said hereafter: hence we have מַלְכָתַיִם as above.

3. The dual number is, for the most part, restricted to things which are double by nature or art, as the parts, or double members of the body, &c. It is never found in the conjugation verbs.

4. There are a few instances in which a dual termination is added to a noun already in the plural

number: as, חֹמֹתַיִם *two walls,* Isa. xxii. 11; לֻחֹתַיִם *two tables,* Ezek. xxvii. 5.

The changes of the preceding vowels will be regulated as before (Art. 99, &c.).

On the Formation of the Plural Number Masculine.

147. Nouns of the masculine gender are made plural by attaching the asyllabic augment ־ִים to the singular: as, טוֹב *good,* masc., טוֹבִים plur.; מֶלֶךְ (for מַלְכְּ or מְלַכְּ) *a king,* plur. מְלָכִים; גּוֹי *a nation,* plur. גּוֹיִם (for גּוֹיִים by omission, Art. 78.) *nations;* נָכְרִי *a stranger,* plur. נָכְרִים (for נָכְרִיִים by contraction and omission, Artt. 78. and 93.). So יְהוּדִים *Jews* (for יְהוּדִיִים).*

2d, In many instances, however, words of this kind are written fully: as, לְוִיִּם *Levites,* sing. לֵוִי; כּוּשִׁיִּים *Cushites* (vulgarly *Ethiopians*); כִּתִּיִּים *Chittim,* Isa. xxiii. 12; יְהוּדִיִּים Esth. iv. 7, viii. 7; כַּשְׂדִּיִּים *Chaldeans,* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17, &c; where the marginal reading is generally of the contracted form.

In one instance א is inserted in the place of *Dāgésh:* as, עַרְבִיאִים for עַרְבִיִּים, or contr. עֲרָבִים *Arabs,* 2 Chron. xvii. 11.

---

* So שָׁנִים pl. of שָׁנִי *scarlet,* Isa. i. 18; חָפְשִׁים of חָפְשִׁי *free,* Isa. lviii. 6; פְּנִימִים of פְּנִימִי *inner,* 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, for פְּנִיִּים, &c.

The ם added to Hebrew masculine plurals, as well as the ן of Syriac and Chaldaic ones, seems to me to have been added for the mere purpose of filling up the hiatus which would have otherwise happened. Such is the *Tanween* (ـً, ـٍ, ـٌ) of the Arabs; which, according to them, is always cut off when the word is placed in the state of *definite* construction, as is also its vicegerent the final ن of the dual and plural. ويجب تجريد المضاف عن التنوين وما يقوم مقامه وهو نون التثنية والجمع &c. *Hidayat-oon-Nahwe,* p. ov. Calcutta, 1803. Moolla Jami considers it as an index of a complete word, which, when lost in the state of construction, is supplied by the following word. Comment. on the Káfia, p. 111.

3d, We sometimes have the Chaldaic termination ־ִין: as, מְלָכִין *kings*, Prov. xxxi. 3; אִין (for אִיִּין) *islands, continents*, Ezek. xxvi. 18, &c. In these cases the plural is termed *Absolute*.

4th, The terminating letters ם, or (Chaldaic) ן, are always omitted, when the plural noun is in the state of definite construction with any other word (Art. 91.), or when any affixed pronoun is attached to it: as, מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ *kings of the land*; מַלְכֵיהֶם *their kings*, of which more will be said hereafter.

5th, In many cases also, when plural words are not in the state of construction, these letters are omitted: as, חוֹסֵי בּוֹ for חוֹסִים בּוֹ *those who trust in him*, Ps. ii. 12, &c.

6th, We occasionally find the termination ־ֵי used instead of ־ִים or ־ִין: as, גוֹבֵי *locusts*, Amos vii. 1, Nah. iii. 17; חַלּוֹנֵי *windows*, Jer. xxii. 14; שָׂרֵי *princes*, Judg. v. 15; הָרֵי *mountains*, Zech. xiv. 5; חוֹרֵי *net works*, Isa. xix. 8; חֲשׂוּפֵי (men, &c.) *uncovered*, Isa. xx. 4; and frequently, שַׁדַּי *the Almighty*; אֲדֹנַי *Lord*, &c. But, as we find that both in the Chaldaic and Syriac this dipthong (־ֵי) is always used when such nouns are in the state of definite construction, we may perhaps conclude, that the termination ־ֵי is nothing more than a contraction for ־ֶי by Art. 93. 3; and, therefore, perfectly equivalent to it in signification; but, not containing any thing superlative, as some have thought. Some have also supposed this termination intended to designate collective nouns; but, as most plural nouns may be considered as collectives, there does not seem to be any necessity for this distinction.

7th, There are, moreover, several passages in which ־ַי has been thought to be a plural termination: as, רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁלִשִׁי *head of the captains*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, which in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xi. 11, is רֹאשׁ הַשְּׁלִישִׁים. So הָרָצִים וְהָרָכִּי *the captains and the guards*, 2 Kings xi. 4, 19. Of this kind some suppose חֲכִנְעֲנִי Gen. xii. 6, xiii. 7; כְּרֵתִי וּפְלֵתִי 2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 7, 23, &c. to be, while others believe the terminating (ִי) to indicate nothing more than a patronymic or gentile noun.* To these some other passages

* I am very much disposed to believe, that the plural termination attached

might be added: as, פְּלִילִי Job xxxi. 28, compared with Ib. v. 11: חֲצִי 1 Sam. xx. 38; חֹרִי Gen. xl. 16; עַמִּי 2 Sam. xxii. 44, Ps. cxliv. 2, Lam. iii. 14, &c.

In such cases as these, ־י may, according to our hypothesis, be a

---

to Hebrew nouns and verbs, is nothing more than a fragment of some word originally used to designate that number. In the Malay, Sanscrit, and some other languages, the plural number is still formed by adding some word or words signifying *much*, *many*, or the like; or, by repeating the same word: as, in the Malay, *Órang bāniak*, or *Órang órang*, *many man*; or *man*, *man*. So in Sanscrit. See Yates's Gram. p. 59.

In the Coptic and New Zealand also, the syllable *ni* or *na*, which is prefixed for the purpose of designating the plural number, seems manifestly to be derived from the word *naa* or *na*, which in both these languages means *great*, *much*, or the like. In Hebrew we find words derived from the root הָוָה or הָיָה *being*, signifying *substance*, &c.: as, הוֹן *wealth*; הוֹן *a great misfortune*, *calamity*; or הַוָּה *a great deep*, *a bath*. In the Arabic هَوًى *inordinate affection*; هَاوِيَةٌ *lust*, *a great deep*, *abyss*: and hence, perhaps, יְהוָה *Jehovah*, *the great being*, emphatically styled ὁ ὤν, הוּא, or הוּא, as well as אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה Exod. iii. 14. Now, if we can conceive a noun of the primitive form פָּקְדָ, i.e. הַיָּה *being*, *substance*, *much*, or the like, thus to be used, we shall have the forms הַיָּה by Euphony, (Art. 114.), and הָיָה by contraction, (Art. 93. 3.). Writing then דְּבַר הָיָה in the form proper for construction but in one word, and striking out the first ה by Art. 79, and the last by Art. 80, we shall have דְּבָרָי for the contracted plural form, to which the Euphonic ם or ן may be added, or not: and without the (·) *Khīrīk*, דְּבָרַי, which is the Syriac and Chaldaic form. Again, taking הָיָה, which is the segolate form proper for construction, and, striking out the two ה *Hé*'s, as before, we shall have דְּבָרִי, which is the termination proper for the state of construction likewise. The termination ־וֹ, or by contraction ־וּ, (Art. 93. 2.), may, for the sake of distinction, have been taken for the verbs from the cognate root הָוָה having the same signification: for, taking the segolate or primitive form הֶוֶה or הֶוֹה, we shall have הוּת by contraction; and, writing פָּקְדוּ for פָּקְדָהוּת, as before, we shall have the plural terminations for some parts of the verb, as also for some nouns above noticed, which, I have no doubt, are real ancient forms of nouns in the plural number; they therefore, stood in no need of correction by the Masorets.

The plural termination of the feminine nouns may have arisen from the same root: for if we take הַוָּה of the form פָּקְדָ, and changing the final ה into ת, which occasionally takes place, we shall have by contraction הוֹת by Art. 93, and, for פּוֹקְדֵךְ הוֹת, פּוֹקְדוֹת as before.

plural termination, the Euphonic ם being cut off: but, as it will be hereafter seen, that (י.) is also the termination of patronymic or gentile nouns, the context alone must be our guide in ascertaining the sense in such passages.

8th, Gesenius is of opinion, that the termination ־ַי is, in some cases, nothing more than an Arabism for the singular ־ָה: as, שָׂדַי for שָׂדֶה *a field*, Deut. xxxii. 13, Ps. viii. 8. So חוֹזַי for חוֹזֶה *a seer*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, &c., which may be true.

9th, Some have also supposed, that ון, and ו without the Euphonic נ, is occasionally used as a plural termination: as, יְשׁוּרוּן *Yĕshūrún* for *Israel*. הִבְרוּ שָׁמַיִם to be read חַבְרוּ שָׁמַיִם (by Art. 93. 2.) *augurs*, i. e. *dividers of the heavens*. So Isa. xlvii. 13, רֻבֵּי תוֹרָתִי (רִבּוּ) *the multitude of my laws*. So יְדֻעוּ Ps. cxix. 79; שְׁנָאוּ 2 Sam. v. 8; בְּנוּ, 1 Chron. vi. 11, &c. In most of these, and similar passages, however, we have a various reading, which supplies the regular plural termination, ־ֵי.

On the Formation of the Plural Number Feminine.

148. The termination used to designate the feminine plural is ־וֹת,* which, like the preceding ־ִים, &c. is asyllabic: as, דּוֹר *a generation*, דּוֹרוֹת (or, Art. 78. דּוֹרֹת) *generations*.

2d, When the feminine singular ends in ־ָה, ־ֶת, or ־ַת, &c., these terminations are rejected in forming the plural: as, פּוֹקֵדָה or פּוֹקֶדֶת *visiting*, (fem.) פּוֹקְדוֹת, plural.† The same may be said of the Chaldaic termination ־ָת; as, תְּהִלָּת *praise*, תְּהִלּוֹת *praises*, Psalm ix. 15, &c.—N. B. אֲמָהוֹת *servant-maids*, seems to be from the singular אַמָּהָה, not אָמָה: so, מְנָאוֹת and מְנָיוֹת are not the plurals of מָנָה, but of מְנִי or מֶנִי: so, קְצָוֹת is from קְצֵוֹ, not קְצָה.

3d, Feminine nouns ending in ־ִית and ־וּת take the

---

* See the note to the preceding article.

† In other words, the feminine plural is formed, rather from the masculine singular than from the feminine singular.

same termination, with this difference, viz. that י, in the first case, is doubled by *Dāgésh*: as, עִבְרִית *a Hebrew woman*, plural עִבְרִיּוֹת (the singular being עִבְרִיֶּת or עִבְרִיָּה): and, in the second, by prefixing י, and preserving the homogeneous imperfect vowel corresponding to ו: as, מַלְכוּת *a kingdom*, מַלְכֻיּוֹת *kingdoms*, as if the singular were a contraction of מַלְכוּיָה.

4th, Nouns ending in ־ִית are sometimes found with their plurals formed by the mere addition of the plural terminations ־ִים or ־וֹת: as, חֲנִית *a spear*, pl. חֲנִיתִים and חֲנִיתוֹת; זְנוּת *fornication*, pl. זְנוּתִים, &c.

5th, So also others ending in ־ֶת; as, דֶּלֶת *a door*, pl. דְּלָתוֹת; קֶשֶׁת *a bow*, pl. קְשָׁתוֹת *bows*; שֶׂפֶת (for שָׂפָה) *a lip*, pl. שְׂפָתוֹת *lips*.

149. The plural belonging to a considerable number of masculine nouns is found with the feminine termination ־וֹת, while, on the other hand, many feminine nouns are also found with the masculine termination ־ִים in the plural: as, 1st, אָב *a father*, pl. אָבוֹת; אוֹצָר *a treasure*, pl. אוֹצָרוֹת; and, 2d, אֶבֶן *a stone*, fem. pl. אֲבָנִים; אֵלָה *a fir-tree*, אֵלִים *fir-trees*: all of which the Lexicons will supply as they occur.

2d, Nouns of the common gender are sometimes found having two plural forms: as, שָׁנָה *a year*, pl. שָׁנִים and שָׁנוֹת *years*: so יָמִים and יָמוֹת *days*, for יְמִים or יְמוֹת, pl. of יוֹם for יֵוֶם *a day*; and, a few others with the masculine added to the feminine form of the plural: as, בָּמָה *a high place*, pl. בָּמוֹת and בָּמוֹתִים. Others again are found only in the plural number: as, פָּנִים *the face*; חַיִּים *life*; נָשִׁים *women*. Others are used in the dual only: as, רֵחַיִם *a mill*; מֹאזְנַיִם *balances*, &c.

150. Generic nouns signifying, as they do, a whole species, may, in the singular number, be construed as being in the plural when the context requires it: as, עוֹף *fowl*, or *fowls*; טַף *child*, or *children*; צֹאן *flock*, or *flocks*.

2d, Hence, nouns signifying *Metals*, *Liquids*, *Virtues*, *Vices*, to which may be added *Proper names*, are generally found in the singular number only: as, כֶּסֶף *silver*, זָהָב *gold*, יַיִן *wine*, יִצְהָר *oil*, חָכְמָה *wisdom*, נְבָלָה *foolishness*, שִׂנְאָה *hatred*, מֹשֶׁה *Moses*, צִפֹּרָה *Zipporah*, יִשְׂרָאֵל *Israel*, &c.

3d, We have, nevertheless, תְּבוּנוֹת *understandings*, אֲהָבִים *loves*, חֲסָדִים *graces*, כְּעָשִׂים *angers*, חָכְמוֹת *wisdoms*, &c.; but, in these cases, an intensitive signification is generally meant.

4th, Nouns implying age are mostly found in the plural number: as, נְעוּרִים *childhood*, עֲלוּמִים *youth*, זְקוּנִים *old age*, &c. We have, nevertheless, יַלְדוּת for *childhood*, and עַלְמוּת for *youth*, to which some others might be added.

5th, Words ending in יוּת and וּת, generally denote the state in which any person or thing is said to be. Hence יַלְדוּת will signify the *state of childhood;* these words therefore need not be put in the plural number. In the other case, the word שָׁנִים is probably understood; we shall have therefore נְעוּרִים for שְׁנֵי נְעוּרִים *childish years;* and so of others, which will account for the apparent anomaly.

The nouns generally found in the dual number have already been pointed out (Art. 146. 3.).

On the Changes found to take place in Nouns, put in the Definite State of Construction.

151. By the definite state of construction is meant, the juxta position of two or more nouns, not meaning the same thing, when the latter is added for the purpose of defining, or otherwise qualifying, that which immediately precedes it: as, יַד יְהוָה *Jehovah's hand;* שֵׁבֶט בַּרְזֶל *a rod of iron;* יְמֵי שְׁנֵי־חַיֵּי אַבְרָהָם *the days of the years of the life of Abraham.*

2d, Now, as these additional words are added for the mere purpose of presenting some *one definite idea*, the whole combination seems to have been considered as presenting one compound word only; and, hence, the tone-accent has occasionally been carried on to the last so construed, and the preceding vowels contracted or rejected, as far as the analogy of the words would allow.

3d, Hence, nouns having perfect and *mutable* *

* What vowels are immutable will be seen when we come to treat of the forms of nouns.

vowels in their ultimate and penultimate syllables, will change that in the ultimate to its homogeneous imperfect one, and reject that in the penultimate: as, דְּבַר יְהוָה *Jehovah's word* (from דָּבָר); תּוֹרַת יְהוָה *Jehovah's law* (from תּוֹרָה).

4th, All feminine nouns, however, ending in ־ָה will change the ה to ת, probably for the purpose of making the character of such words more susceptible to the hearer, than they would be with the ה remaining (Art. 146. 2.).

5th, Exceptions:—All masculine nouns singular ending in ־ָה* will take ־ַת when preceding others in the state of construction: as, מִקְנַה־אַבְרָם *Abram's stock.* But Segolate nouns are subject to no variation in the singular number: as, מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר *the king of Assyria.*

6th, Segolate nouns, however, having ו or י for their middle radical letter, will undergo a contraction when preceding other nouns in the state of definite construction: as, תּוֹךְ הַגָּן *midst of the garden,* (from תָּוֶךְ of תַּוֶךְ), by Art. 93. 1; בֵּית יַעֲקֹב *house of Jacob*;† דֵּי בָּעֶר (for דַּיֵּה) *sufficient* (pl.) *for burning,* Isa. xl. 16. (Art. 93. 3.)

7th, All masculine dual and plural nouns ending in ־ַיִם and ־ִים respectively, will take the termination ־ֵי, and reject the preceding vowel, whenever it is perfect and mutable, or otherwise contract it: e. g. דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה *Jehovah's words* (sing. דָּבָר); עֵינֵי יְהוָה, (sing. עַיִן or עֵן, dual עֵינַיִם) *Jehovah's eyes.* In these cases, the terminating ם of the dual or plural may be considered as

---

* This terminating vowel seems to be taken in this case, in order to avoid confounding these nouns with feminines ending in ־ָה.

† Hence, perhaps, the termination ־ֵי in plural masculine nouns, as דִּבְרֵי is for דִּבְרַיִהִי, see Art. 147. 7. note.

being purely euphonic, as the ו also is in the Chaldaic, Syriac, and Arabic (Art. 91.).

On the termination ־ָה, occasionally found in this situation, see Art. 147. 6.

8th, From the examples already given, it will be seen, that this construction may be translated, generally, by the genitive case in other languages: but, as one or other of the particles is often introduced for this purpose, as well as to form combinations equivalent in signification to the different cases of the Greek and Latin grammars, the Student is referred to the Syntax for further information on this subject.

LECTURE VI.

ON THE PARTS OF SPEECH IN GENERAL, AND ON THE NOUN IN PARTICULAR.

152. HAVING laid down and exemplified the general principles of syllabication, &c. as found to prevail in this Language, we now come to consider the different parts of speech, and to shew how they stand in their primitive state, or as derived from one another.

1st, The Hebrew language is, like all others, found to consist of nouns, verbs, and particles,* so arranged in sentences, as to present to the mind such ideas as are intended to be conveyed by the speaker or writer of any discourse. Of these, the third person singular masculine of the verb has generally been taken as the root, or theme, from which the other parts of speech have been derived. For my own part, however, I believe that the noun ought to be considered as the root; not only, because the learner may by this means be enabled more clearly to see how the conjugations of the verbs are carried on; but, also, because he may ascertain, with a much greater degree of precision, the force of all those nouns, which have hitherto been considered as branches of the verb. There are, besides, other reasons which induce me to believe that the noun ought to be considered as the root: they are these; 1st, There are some classes of the verbs which do not exhibit the root fully in the third person singular masculine of the preterite: and these comprehend all those verbs which have

---

† The Arabian and Jewish grammarians comprehend in these all the other parts of speech generally given in the grammars of Europe.

ו or י for the middle radical, which are found complete in the noun, but defective in the verb. In some others, indeed, the noun appears in a defective form; but, in these cases, it is never found complete in the verb. Again, the variation found to prevail in the last vowel of the preterite is more naturally accounted for in the noun than in the verb; and it is a fact, that a noun having the same vowel is almost universally found to exist. Besides, the participial and other nouns, which have no tenses in themselves, are better understood, by considering them as derived from the primitive nouns, than from words conjugated as verbs. Add to this the circumstance, that a verb in the state of conjugation either is, or must be, considered as being, compounded with a pronoun, and, therefore, in an unfit state to be considered as a primitive word. It is without these pronouns, as well as every other adjunct, and when the noun is in its primitive form, that we consider it as a root;* and, this we contend, is

---

* The school of Basra hold the same opinion with reference to the Arabic. See Ebn Farhát on this subject in M. De Sacy's Gram. Arabe, vol. i. p. 229, note. M. De Sacy himself thinks it will come to the same thing whether we consider the infinitive form as the root, or whether we take the third person singular masculine of the preterite, because the one may be termed the *logical root*, the other the *etymological* one, ib. p. 197. But why, it may be asked, are we to have two roots for the same word? And why may not that, which is termed the *logical* root, be also considered as the *etymological* one? If the one presents a form more simple than the other, which is the fact, Why, I ask, may not the less simple be considered as being derived from the other? I must confess, whatever the school of Koufa may think of it, that of Basra appears to me to have reason on their side in this question; and to their opinion I am therefore, compelled to subscribe, which M. De Sacy has also done at p. 128, note *a* of his second vol. See also the Mikhlol of Kimkhi, fol. קצא verso, where he expressly says, that such words as *Reuben*, *Simeon*, *Zebulun*, and the like, are derived from verbs; but that in such as חָכָם, רָשָׁע, צַדִּיק, חֶרֶב, שֶׂלֶג, the verb is derived from the noun, נגזר הפועל מן השם. The same doctrine is taught by De Balmes, when speaking of the forms of nouns.

the more natural way to proceed. Induced by these considerations, then, to give the noun the first place in treating of the etymology, we shall proceed to give the forms of the personal pronouns, as used either in connection, or not, with other nouns; not, because these words have any prior claim to our consideration; but, because we shall thereby enable ourselves to shew, when we come to detail the forms of the nouns, how these pronouns are connected with them.

No one need be alarmed on this new, or rather *old*, view of the subject before us, as to the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The only difference that can possibly arise will be, that in one case the translator will see more clearly the mind of his author, and the force of the passage he may have to translate, than he otherwise could. Nor will our lexicons or commentaries be thus rendered useless: the only difference will be, that what a lexicographer may consider as a verb, we should consider as being originally a noun; but which, by the process of conjugation with some pronoun, has assumed the functions of a verb: but, in every case, the general sense given will be the same, provided both parties agree in the radical signification of such word.—Let us now proceed to the personal pronouns.

Of the Pronouns.

153. The pronouns are, in the Hebrew, as in other languages, 1. *Personal*, 2. *Demonstrative*, 3. *Relative*,

---

See also Le Court de Gebelin, Monde Primitif. vol. iii. pp. 55, 56, 80, &c.; Mr. Forster's Essay on Sanscrit Gram. p. 540; Caroli Aurivillii Dissertationes Goet. 1790, p. 376, &c. It is a curious fact, that in the Burman, verbs are nothing more than participial nouns conjugated with the pronouns. See Carey's Grammar of the Burman, p. 79, &c. See also Humboldt on the Chinese, Journal Asiatique, vol. iv. p. 115.

and, 4. *Interrogative,* with which, 5. the *Reflective,* pronouns and the Definite Article, are sometimes classed. We shall, at present, consider the *Personal* Pronouns only.

The Personal Pronouns.

1st, These are termed *Separable,* and *Inseparable.* When *Separable,* they may be considered as representing the person, to which they belong, in the nominative case: when *Inseparable,* they exhibit only a part of the *Separable* pronoun attached to some other word. When attached to verbs, they may be said to represent either the objective, or some other oblique case; but, when attached to nouns, they stand for the correspondent possessive pronoun: there being no other way of expressing the possessive pronominal sense in Hebrew.

2d, The *Separable* personal pronouns are as follows:

1 Person.

Sing. Com. Gen.

אֲנִי, or אָנֹכִי..... ..... *I.*

Plur.

אֲנַחְנוּ, rarely נַחְנוּ, and once אָנָוּ *We.*

2 Person.

Sing. Masc.

אַתָּה, rarely אַתְּ ..... *Thou.*

Plur.

אַתֶּם..... *You.*

Sing. Fem.

אַתְּ, rarely אַתִּי..... *Thou*

Plur.

אַתֶּן אַתֵּנָה ..... *You.*

3 Person.

Sing. Masc.

הוּא..... *He.*

Plur.

הֵם, occasionally הֵמָּה..... *They.*

Sing. Fem.

הִיא, anciently הִוא.

Plur.

הֵן, occasionally הֵנָּה.

3d, There are three instances in which אַתְּ *thou*, is used in the masculine gender: viz. Num. xi. 15, Deut. v. 24, and Ezek. xxviii. 14. אַתֶּם is used as a feminine, Ezek. xiii. 20: הֵמָּה is also used as a feminine, Cant. vi. 8, Ruth i. 22, Zech. v. 10: and הֵנָּה as a masculine, 2 Sam. iv. 6, Jer. l. 5. הֵן also occurs as a masculine, Ruth i. 13. We also have הִיא for הוּא, 1 Kings xvii. 15; and הִוא for הִיא throughout the Pentateuch, if we except eleven instances. This is usually ascribed to an archaism, grounded on the supposition, that in ancient times the pronouns were all considered as being of the common gender.

4th, אָנֹכִי is probably a foreign word: Egyptian, perhaps, where we have ANOK, there being no trace of it in any of the sister dialects of the Hebrew. Gesenius finds it, however, in the Phœnician.*

5th, The *Dāgésh* of אַתָּה, אַתְּ, אַתִּי, אַתֶּם, and אַתֶּן, is put as a compensation for נ, which has been thrown out (Art. 82.), but which is still retained in the dialects.

6th, The *Inseparable* pronouns are abbreviated forms of the pronouns above given; they are invariably found attached to some preceding word, whether that be a noun, verb, or particle.† The following is a table of their forms, as attached to nouns; we shall give those for the verbs hereafter.

---

* Lehregebäude, page 200, note.

† This may be considered as an illustration of the principle of thus abridging and compounding words in Hebrew; and as confirming in a great degree the remarks offered in the note, Art. 147. 7. above.

		Sing. Com. Gen.	For Nouns Sing.	For Nouns Plur.	
For the 1 Pers.		אֲנִי, or אָנֹכִי we have	ִי—	ִי—	*my*, or *mine*.
		Plur.			
		אֲנַחְנוּ, or נַחְנוּ	נוּ— or ֵנוּ—	ינוּ—	*our*, or *ours*.
2 Pers.		Sing. Masc.			
		אַתָּה, or אַתְּ	ךָ, ֶךָ— , or ְךָ— ..	יךָ—	*thy*, or *thine*.
		Plur.			
		אַתֶּם	כֶם	יכֶם—	*your, or yours*.
		Sing. Fem.			
		אַתְּ, or אַתִי	ךְ, or ֵךְ—	יךְ—, or יכִי—	*thy*, or *thine*.
		Plur.			
		אַתֶּן or אַתֵּנָה	כֶן	יכֶן—	*your*, or *yours*.
3 Pers.		Sing. Masc.			
		הוּא	ו, הוּ, וֹ, ה, or הוּ—	יו—, ָו—, poet. יהוּ—	*his*, *its*.
		Plur.			
		הֵם	ם, ֶם— , poet. מוֹ—	יהֶם—, poet. ימוֹ—	*their*, *theirs*.
		Sing. Fem.			
		הִיא, or הוּא	הָ—, ה, ֶה—	יהָ—	*hers*, *her*.
		Plur.			
		הֵן, or הֵנָּה	נָה— , ן, ֵן, הֶן—	יהֶן—	*their*, *theirs*.

7th, It is to be observed, that in affixing these abbreviated pronouns to singular nouns, it will be necessary, when such word does not end in a vowel, to take that form of the pronoun which has one. This is called the *Vowel of union*. In this case, an accent will always accompany it as given above, except in those cases wherein the affix itself takes the accent. But, when the preceding word ends in a vowel, no such *union vowel* can be introduced: in that case, the abbreviated pronoun is taken which has no such preceding vowel of union.

8th, Nouns ending in י, will drop that letter upon receiving the affixed pronoun of the first person singular: as, גּוֹי *a nation*; גּוֹי *my nation*, for גּוֹיִי.

9th, The words אָב *a father*; אָח *a brother*; and חָם *a father-in-law*; and פֶּה *the mouth*, will take י when put in construction with a foregoing noun, or when receiving any one of the above pronominal

affixes, which may be dropped by the rule (No. 8.): as, אָבִי for אַבִּי (the root being אבה) *my father*; אָבִיךָ *thy father* (masc.), אָבִיךְ *thy* (fem.) *father*; אָבִיו *his father*, and so on. Some other words ending in י for ה may take the affixed pronouns in the same way: as, פְּרִי *fruit*; פְּרִיהֶם *their fruit*; or, they may take it with a *vowel of union*: as, פִּרְיָם or פִּרְיָן *their* (masc. and fem.) *fruit*.

10th, Here, however, the masculine form of the pronominal affix is sometimes taken, when the sense seems to require the feminine, and *vice versâ*, see Gen. xxxi. 9, Ruth i. 8. 9. 11. 13, Ezek. xiii. 19. 20. 21, Jer. ix. 19. So also חוּ for הָ, כָּמֹחוּ for כָּמוֹהָ Exod. xi. 6, twice. In the same manner we have מִמֶּנּוּ for מִמֶּנָּה Jud. xi. 34; ם for ן, as, שִׁבְּלֵם for שִׁבְּלֵן Cant. iv. 2, vi. 6. So Exod. ii. 17, 2 Sam. xx. 3, twice, Psal. cxix. 152. So הֵם for הֵן Exod. i. 21, Num. xxxvi. 6, twice, Job xix. 15, Ezek. xxiii. 45. 47, Ezr. x. 3. 44, Zech. v. 9, xi. 5; מוֹ as a feminine in לָמוֹ Lam. iv. 10. On these apparent discrepancies, however, see the Syntax.

11th, On the contrary, ן occurs for ם: as, לְאַרְבַּעְתָּן for לְאַרְבַּעְתָּם *to them four*, Ezek. i. 10, twice; and again, ver. 16. 18. Also in בְּלֶכְתָּן Ib. ver. 9. 12. 17, *in their going*; הֵן also occurs as a masculine רִבְעֵיהֶן *their four* (sides), Ib. ver. 17; and again, in ver. 18. 24. 25. Also with a paragogic ה; as, גְּוִיֹּתֵיהֶנָּה *their bodies*, Ib. ver. 11.

12th, In affixing these pronouns to nouns, it must be remembered that they are not made to agree, either in number or person, with the nouns to which they are attached, but with those to which they relate, as to the sense.

13th, Such of these inseparable pronouns as commence with a consonant, and make a syllable independently of any part of the preceding word, are to be considered as *Syllabic*; these are, that of the first person plural, נוּ; those of the second, כָה, דְ, כֶם, and כֶן; of the third, חוּ, הָ, הֶם, and הֶן. Such as do not constitute a syllable in themselves but require the addition of a letter from the preceding word, have been termed *Asyllabic*; see Art. 98, &c. Of these are the remaining pronouns, viz. ־ִי, ־ֵי, דְ, וֹ, וּ, ם, הָ and ן.

14th, Of these inseparable pronouns כֶם, כֶן, הֶם, and הֶן, are termed *grave* (Art. 123. 2.), because they always have the accent. The others are, by way of contradistinction, termed *light*.

It is of importance to make these distinctions, because the changes of the vowels of the preceding word, will, in a great measure, depend upon it: e. g. דָּבָר *a word.* If I affix יִ— *my, mine,* the ר of דָּבָר must be taken in order to enounce this vowel: as, דָּ־בָ־רִי. But, by our laws of syllabication the preceding ב must have a perfect vowel, (ַ) will, therefore, remain unchanged. And, as the first (ָ) is not immutable, and, as the accent is with the affix, it will become (ֳ) and we shall have דָּבָרִי. This holds good with all the *asyllabic* affixes. But if I take a *syllabic* affix; let it be כֶם *your;* we shall then have דְּבַרְכֶם *your word.* In this case, the ר of דָּבָר concludes its last syllable; and, as the accent is removed, the (ַ) preceding this letter originally, must, by our laws of syllabication become (-) and we have accordingly דְּבַרְכֶם. But if we take ךָ which is also *syllabic,* we shall not have דְּבַרְךָ, but דְּבָרְךָ; because, although the affix ךָ is *syllabic,* the accent nevertheless accompanies the preceding syllable, which therefore remains perfect (Art. 34.) and we have דְּבָרְךָ. The same holds good in all other cases.

15th, Any word preceding one or other of these affixes may be considered as being in construction with it; and, therefore, subject to all those changes in the vowels, to which words so situated are (Art. 151. 3.). The only difference being, that, instead of the latter noun being written at length, it has been abbreviated, by one or other of the rules detailed in Art. 78, &c.

16th, The following are examples of the application of the Inseparable pronouns to nouns singular and plural, masculine and feminine. No example of the dual is given, because it always takes the affixes proper for the plural: as, עֵינַיִם *two eyes,* עֵינַי *my eyes,* &c.

Sing. Masc.	סוּס	*a horse.*
1 pers. sing. com.	סוּסִי	*my horse.*
2 ..... masc.	סוּסְךָ or סוּסֵכָה	*thy horse.*
2 ..... fem.	סוּסֵךְ	*thy horse.*
3 ..... masc.	סוּסוֹ or סוּסָהּ	*his horse.*
3 ..... fem.	סוּסָהּ, rarely סוּסָהּ	*her horse.*
1 pers. plur. com.	סוּסֵנוּ	*our horse.*
2 ..... masc.	סוּסְכֶם	*your horse.*
2 ..... fem.	סוּסְכֶן	*your horse.*
3 ..... masc.	סוּסָם, poetice סוּסָמוֹ	*their horse.*
3 ..... fem.	סוּסָן or סוּסָנָה	*their horse.*

Plur. Masc.	סוּסִים	*horses.*
1 pers. sing. com.	סוּסַי	*my horses.*
2 ..... masc.	סוּסֶיךָ	*thy horses.*
2 ..... fem.	סוּסָיִךְ	*thy horses.*
3 ..... masc.	סוּסָיו or סוּסָו	*his horses.*
3 ..... fem.	סוּסֶיהָ	*her horses.*
1 pers. plur. com.	סוּסֵינוּ	*our horses.*
2 ..... masc.	סוּסֵיכֶם	*your horses.*
2 ..... fem.	סוּסֵיכֶן	*your horses.*
3 ..... masc.	סוּסֵיהֶם, or poetice סוּסֵימוֹ	*their horses.*
3 ..... fem.	סוּסֵיהֶן	*their horses.*

17th, Example of a feminine noun in both numbers with the affixed pronouns.

Singular.	תּוֹרָה	*a law.*
1 pers. sing. com.	תּוֹרָתִי*	*my law.*

---

* The final ה becomes ת by Art. 151. 4.

2 pers. sing. masc.	תּוֹרָתְךָ	*thy law.*
2 ..... fem.	תּוֹרָתֵךְ	*thy law.*
3 ..... masc.	תּוֹרָתוֹ or תּוֹרָתָהּ	*his, its law.*
3 ..... fem.	תּוֹרָתָהּ, rarely תּוֹרָתָהּ	*her, its law.*
1 pers. plur. com.	תּוֹרָתֵנוּ	*our law.*
2 ..... masc.	תּוֹרַתְכֶם	*your law.*
2 ..... fem.	תּוֹרַתְכֶן	*your law.*
3 ..... masc.	תּוֹרָתָם, poeticè תּוֹרָתָמוֹ	*their law.*
3 ..... fem.	תּוֹרָתָן תּוֹרָתָנָה	*their law.*

Plural.	תּוֹרוֹת	*laws.*
1 pers. sing. com.	תּוֹרוֹתַי	*my laws.*
2 ..... masc.	תּוֹרוֹתֶיךָ	*thy laws.*
2 ..... fem.	תּוֹרוֹתַיִךְ or יְכִי—	*thy laws.*
3 ..... masc.	תּוֹרוֹתָיו or תּוֹרוֹתָו	*his, its laws.*
3 ..... fem.	תּוֹרוֹתֶיהָ	*her, its laws.*
1 pers. plur. com.	תּוֹרוֹתֵינוּ	*our laws.*
2 ..... masc.	תּוֹרוֹתֵיכֶם	*your laws.*
2 ..... fem.	תּוֹרוֹתֵיכֶן	*your laws.*
3 ..... masc.	תּוֹרוֹתֵיהֶם, or poeticè יְמוֹ—	*their laws.*
3 ..... fem.	תּוֹרוֹתֵיהֶן	*their laws.*

18th, Nouns ending in ה־ take the affix חוּ־ instead of וֹ or ֹ in the third person singular masculine, rejecting first their final letter ה: as, עָלֶה *a leaf*; עָלֵחוּ *his leaf*; שָׂדֶה *a field*; שָׂדֵחוּ *his field*. In the same manner they reject their final letter when they receive the feminine affix of the same person, which is either הּ־ or ָהּ: as, שָׂדֵהּ *a field*; שָׂדָהּ *her field*; מִקְרֶה *an accident*; מִקְרֶהָ *her accident*, Ruth ii. 3; מַרְאֶה *an appearance*; מַרְאֶהָ *its appearance*.

Anomalies.

19th, שֵׁוְיוֹ *his flock* (of sheep), Deut. xxii. 1, from שֵׁוֶה. The affix חוּ־ is occasionally found attached to other nouns: as, פִּילַגְשֵׁחוּ

his concubine, Judg. xix. 24; מֹטֵהוּ *his yoke*, Nah. i. 13; אוֹרֵהוּ *his light*, Job xxv. 3. And also with plurals: as, גִּבּוֹרֵיהוּ *his heroes*, Nah. ii. 4.

20th, The following examples are also anomalous. 2 Pers. masc. חֶלְכָּה Ps. x. 14; according to some. 2 Pers. fem. שְׁלִשְׁתֵּיךְ *thy third part*, with י inserted, Ezek. v. 12; לְתִתֶּךָּ *giving thee*, Ib. xxiii. 28; כֻּלָּא for כֻּלָּהּ *the whole of it*.

Of the first person plural מוֹדַעְתָּנוּ *our acquaintance*, Ruth iii. 2; קִימָנוּ *our substance*, Job xxii. 20. Of the second fem. זִמַּתְכֶּנָּה *your baseness*, Ezek. xxiii. 48.

Of the third masc. כֻּלָּהֶם *all of them*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 6. Of the third fem. כֻּלָּהֶנָּה *the whole of them*. So Gen. xli. 21; קִרְבֶּנָּה for קִרְבָּן *the midst of them*.

With Nouns Plural.

21st, 1 Pers. sing. עֵדוֹתַי for עֵדוֹתָי *my testimonies*, Ps. cxxxii. 12. The union vowels of the affix of the 3 fem. sing. are sometimes contracted: as, אַחַיוֹתֵךְ (Art. 93. 3.) for אַחָיוֹתַיִךְ *thy sisters*, Ezek. xvi. 52, &c., in which case the י *Yod* is dropped. This sometimes takes place in the masc. pronoun: as, מַכּוֹתֵךְ *thy strokes*, for מַכּוֹתַיִךְ Deut. xxviii. 59. So מַלְאָכֶיהָ *thy messengers*, Nah. ii. 14. It. 2d fem. כְּסָתוֹתֵיכֶנָּה *your pillows*. Of the 3d masc. תַּגְמוּלוֹתַי *his benefits*, Ps. cxvi. 12. Of the Chaldaic form: אֲלֵיהֶמָּה *their posts*. 3d fem. אַתְיָקֶיהָא *its galleries*; גְּוִיּוֹתֵיהֶנָּה *their bodies*, Ezek. i. 11, &c.

22d, The affix כֶּם of the 2d pers. plur. masc. is, in one instance, preceded by (·);* as, תְּפוּצוֹתֵיכֶם *your dispersions*, Jer. xxv. 34. These may all perhaps be the result of errors in transcription.

23d, The י which precedes the affixed pronouns in the plural numbers of nouns is frequently dropped: as, דַּרְכֶּךָ for דַּרְכֶּיךָ *thy ways*, &c. But, many of these anomalies will come under the rules detailed in Artt. 78. 147. 7, &c. and will, therefore, be rather apparent than real; the rest perhaps are the mere mistakes of the copyists.

N.B. The demonstrative and other pronouns will be given when we come to treat on the particles.

On the Use, Signification, and Forms of Words generally.

154. Words are nothing more than sounds, simple or

---

* In some editions regularly י֫.

compound, which have been allowed by mutual consent to represent the ideas conceived in the mind of one person to that of another. Whether any of these were first imparted to man by the Creator, or whether he had only the powers given sufficient for appropriating such sounds for the purposes of conversation, it is impossible now to say: nor is it very important; for, in either case, their adoption will be traced to the appointment of the Deity, either mediately, or immediately. From what is revealed in the Scriptures, I am inclined to believe, that it was an immediate appointment, as far at least as the necessities of man might first have required; leaving it to his ingenuity to extend and cultivate them as the increasing wants or refinements of society might suggest. If, then, this gift was immediate, nothing can be more probable than that the use of words would be grounded upon some analogy; which, it is likely, would also have been the case, had unassisted reason been left to shift for itself. In any case, then, we might expect to find that some analogy had been resorted to in the structure of language, whether we originally possessed the skeleton of it either as given by inspiration, or, as made by man for his own use. Substances must have had names, and these must have been such as would generally be allowed, whether we can now see their suitableness or not. The same must be true of events; and whether we can now see the reason why certain words, or sorts of words, have been employed for these purposes or not, it must be next to certain, that there once was some immediate cause for both their adoption and forms.

2d, If then this be the real state of the case, it may be worth while to consider, in the next place, how the primitive significations of words would in process of time be varied, in order to meet the necessities which would

daily arise. Let us, in the first place, take the word הָלַךְ *walking, going, proceeding.* This, we can suppose, was the name given to that sort of action, whereby a person removes himself from one place to another. If then we add some other words, this may be made to mean, proceeding *towards,* either as a friend or an enemy.—*From, with,* &c. with the additional ideas of *co-operation, resistance, joining, opposing,* or the like. In the next place, this action might be applied to the mind, and then signify, its *progress, improvement, general conduct, conversation,* &c. and, in such acceptations is this word used. Hence, Enoch is said to have *walked* with God, יִתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוֹךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים, Gen. v. 22. Again, it may be applied to the state of any thing, as being in progress, and this may be understood as intimating either *increase* or *diminution:* as, וַיֵּלֶךְ הָלוֹךְ וְגָדֵל, Gen. xxvi. 13. So, *he proceeded, proceeding and becoming great,* i. e. *gradually.* And, Ib. viii. 3, &c. וַיָּשֻׁבוּ הַמַּיִם הָלוֹךְ וָשׁוֹב וַיַּחְסְרוּ . . . . . *and the waters returned . . . . . proceeding and returning, and they decreased,* &c. And hence this word is often used in the sense of proceeding *gradually.** Again, let us take the word עָלָה *rising, mounting up,* &c. This, then, with certain adjuncts, may signify *to become superior to,* or *to get the upper hand over,* another; to *conquer* him, to *humble* him; also to *excel* in state, dignity, power, &c.: the being conversant *upon,* or *about,* any thing: being *near* a place or thing, *before* it, or, as we say in English, *over against* it: also, *over* and *above,* implying *excess:* being *incumbent upon,* as a duty, &c. all of which

---

* So also the Persian رفته رفته *going, going,* for *gradually.* So Virgil, Vires acquirit *eundo.*

might arise out of the primitive word, by considering it, either in its proximate or remote bearings: and such are the acceptations in which this word, in one form or other, is actually found.

3d, If then we can conceive that words would thus be made to vary in their significations, in consequence of their different bearings, as above noticed, we shall find no difficulty in also seeing, how the *cause, beginning, continuation, completion, consequence,* &c. of any action may be intimated by such words, as also the *ability, duty, right, will, endeavour, custom, occasion, permission, notification,* &c. which may also be implicated in the more remote signification of such words: which according to the Grammarians and Commentators,* has actually taken place in many instances in the Hebrew; as, indeed, it has, in a greater or less degree, in all languages; and which is nothing more than the necessity of the case absolutely requires.

4th, The *law* or *necessity* by which this variety has been brought about, has, for convenience sake, been termed *Tropology,* which, for the same reason, has been divided into *Metonymy, Irony, Metaphor,* and *Synecdoche.* METONYMY respects *cause and effect; subject and adjunct:* IRONY, *contrariety:* METAPHOR, *comparison:* SYNECDOCHE, distribution, as to the whole with reference to its parts; the *genus* to its *species,* the *material* to the *thing composed out of it,* &c. For a full account of which the reader is referred to the second volume of the Philologia Sacra of Glassius, or the work of Storr, books which every student of the Hebrew Language ought to have.

---

* See Glass. Philolog. Sacr. Ed. Dathe. p. 178—249. &c. Storr. Observ. p. 1, &c.

5th, Let it be remembered, however, we are not to recur to these figures, in order to reconcile any passage we may meet with, to our own preconceived notions. It must appear clearly from the context, considered in conjunction with the character of the writer we may be consulting, that such figure has really been used, otherwise we shall make the sacred writers occasionally to talk like madmen; and perhaps extract from the same writer, nay the same passage, the most incongruous and discordant notions.

6th, When, therefore, we have to give the meaning of any particular word, which seems to present some difficulty, we must consider carefully whether the primitive, or some derived signification, is to be used. When the usual acceptation of such word will answer our purpose, the work is done, and we need proceed no further: but, when this is not the case, we must try in what way our principles will help us: e. g. We find in Job ii. 9, the following passage, which has given no small trouble to the Translators and Commentators: בָּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים וָמֻת, which in our authorized version is, "Curse God and die." The word from which the principal difficulty has here arisen is בָּרֵךְ. The best explanation I can give is this: ברך used as a verb, seems first to have been applied to camels, when kneeling down to receive their *burdens*.* Hence, perhaps, the idea of submission in kneeling for the purpose of receiving something from a superior: and hence also receiving a blessing; and, actively, giving or bestowing one: also to ask or receive a blessing on

---

* See the *Sihâh* of Jauhari and the *Kâmoos* under this word, which give الزيادة والنماء *increase*, and السعادة *happiness*, &c. as its meaning, &c. See also Gen. xxvii. 36, Jos. xv. 19, &c.

departing, &c. To which קְלָלָה *lightness* is opposed as being *a curse*, Gen. xxvii. 12, &c. In the next place, as *imposing a burden* seems to be connected with the primitive meaning of this word, this signification also may be taken in the sense of *oppression, affliction;** and, actively, treating or considering another as the author of it; which, I believe, is the meaning of the word in this place. Storr (p. 37—8.) has taken it in the sense of *bidding farewell*, and hence of *forsaking* and *giving up*. Parkhurst, with some of his school, has taken it as an *irony* here, which is hardly necessary.—What has here been said is intended to refer to unaugmented words generally. On the augmented ones we shall have something to offer hereafter.

7th, With reference to the forms of Hebrew words the student will readily perceive, that if the root in its simplest form, which is constant, will always represent a certain class of words; then, upon any augmentation being made either in its vowels or consonants, or both, other forms will be produced, which may severally represent words of other classes, each having meanings or shades of meaning peculiar to themselves: and, such is actually the case.

8th, If then this be the case, we can adopt certain words representing the various forms found to prevail; and these we can use, like the formulæ in Algebra, to

---

* The Author of the *Kāmoos* has والحمالة او رجالها الذين يسعون ويتحملونها &c. which are all to this purpose. So ذلل is taken to signify *baseness* in a bad sense, and *humility* in a good one. See the Moallakah of Antara by Menil and Wilmet, p. 135. The same is the case with many other Arabic words. See also the Notæ Miscellaneæ appended to the Porta Mosis by Pococke, cap. ii.

designate whole classes of others having the same forms. Thus, פָּקָד, may be put for any word, having the vowel *Páthakh* only, between its first and second radical letters. In like manner פָּקָד, פְּקֶד, פִּקֵּד, may represent any others having a *Khōlém*, *Tzēré*, or *Khīrík*, in the same place, respectively, which are the forms of primitive nouns, generally having an abstract signification. In the next place, פָּקָד, פָּקֶד, פָּקֹד, פָּקוּד, &c. or, with one or other of the letters הֵאֱמַנְתִּי, as, מַפְקֵד, פָּקְדָה, &c. may represent other words, having the same vowels or consonants either preceding or following the same letters of the root respectively, and may each be severally put down as a formulæ designating any class of such words. And, as the roots of words in Hebrew always consist of three letters, the servile letters or vowels being always the same, these formulæ can always be applied.

9th, In the Rabbinic grammars, dictionaries, and commentaries, the word פעל, with its variations, is taken as the common measure of all other words; but, as great inconvenience arises from the use of this word, on account of the medial ע, we have, with Schrœderus and others, taken פקד, not indeed that it is entirely unexceptionable, there being one of the בגדכפת letters, both as its initial and final letter: but because it is sufficiently applicable to our purpose.

155. It will appear from what has been said (Artt. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82.) that primitive nouns, originally consisting of *three* radical letters, may frequently be found with *two* only; and there are cases to be noticed hereafter, in which we have but *one*. Making these allowances, therefore, the forms of all nouns will be either *Simple*, *Augmented*, or *Compound*.

2d, The simple forms, as already noticed (Art. 154. 8.) will consist of the radical letters (supposing none

of them to have been dropped as mentioned above) accompanied by one or two vowels.

3d, The augmented forms of nouns will consist of one or other of the simple forms augmented, either by the reduplication of its middle radical letter by *Dāgésh*, or by the addition of one or more of the letters הֶאֱמַנְתִּי, or by both taken together.

4th, Compound words are those which are formed by the combination of one or more words, simple or augmented, written together as one, contracted or abridged it may be as the rules may require.

5th, The simple forms may be divided into two classes, the first of which may, from their peculiarities, be termed Segolates: the second, Primitive nouns, only.

6th, By Segolate nouns is meant, nouns, which in addition to their primitive vowel, generally introduce an additional (ֶ) for the sake of Euphony (Art. 114.). In the other class of primitive nouns this does not take place.

7th, We shall first consider the different sorts of Segolate nouns, and then proceed to the others, whether simple, augmented, or compounded; giving, at the same time, the forms which they severally assume in forming the plural number—in the state of construction, whether singular or plural; and when having any of the pronouns attached to them.

156. The forms of the primitive Segolate nouns are the following: viz. I. פֶּקֶד, the alternate form of which is, פֶּקֶד or פֶּקֶד: II. פֶּקֶד, alt. פֶּקֶד: III. פֶּקֶד, alt. פֶּקֶד: IV. פֶּקֶד, alt. פֶּקֶד: V. פֶּקֶד, alt. פֶּקֶד; which are generally abstract in signification; and, in the leading form, have the accent on the penultimate (Art. 123. 1.).

2d, Now, as the pronunciation of the leading forms of these words would, in many cases, be exceedingly dif-

ficult, an additional vowel, (ֶ) *Sēgól,* for the most part, is introduced in order to obviate that difficulty (Art. 114.): e. g. instead of saying פָּקְדָ, where it would scarcely be possible to enounce the ד, by introducing (ֶ), we shall have פָּקֶדְ; and, in order to avoid the concurrence of two dissimilar vowels, the former will also become (ֶ), and then we shall have פֶּקֶדְ instead of פָּקְדָ. Hence, we have מֶלֶדְ for מַלְדְ *a king;* סֶפֶר for סִפְרְ or סְפָר *a book;* and so of some of the other forms.

In some cases, however, where no difficulty of pronunciation would arise, the primitive form is retained: as, גַּיְא *a valley;* חֲטָאְ *sin;* נֵרְדְ *nard;* קְשָׁטְ *justice;* which also occurs with (ֶ): as, קֶשָׁט Ps. lx. 6, and also in the alternate form קְשָׁט Dan. ii. 47, iv. 34.

3d, In all cases, in which this class of words will, by the accidence of Grammar, receive any asyllabic augment, there will no longer remain a necessity for this Euphonic vowel, and then the primitive or alternate form of the word will be used: as, מַלְכּוֹ *his king;* מַלְכֵי *kings* (in construction); and מְלָכִים (from the alternate form מְלַדְ) *kings,* when not in the state of construction. So also in the feminine form, מַלְכָּה *a queen,* which in the plural number will take the alternate form מְלָכוֹת, from מְלַדְ, as before. The (ֵ) becomes (ֶ) *Kāméts,* by Artt. 99. 147. So also שִׁכְמוֹ *his shoulder,* from שֶׁכֶם *shoulder;* קָדְשׁוֹ *his holiness,* from קֹדֶשׁ. The accent being removed, causes the first vowel to become imperfect (Art. 34, &c.).

4th, As we have already laid down the rules relating to the formation of the feminine gender of nouns (Art. 142.), of the plural number (Artt. 146, 148, &c.), to the state of construction (Art. 151.), and to the inseparable pronouns as affecting the nouns (Art. 153.),

it is now our intention to shew, in each form as far as necessary, in what way the vowels are affected by these circumstances. We have chosen this method of detailing what has been termed the *mutationes punctorum*, because this seems to be the only one likely to be of any service to the Student. In the grammars of Buxtorf and others of his school, it was customary to give a considerable number of rules on this subject, with a few examples; and then to leave the Student to make his way as well as he could. But, as the analogy of words is the only sure guide, little use could be made of the rules, until the Learner had become familiar with it; and, when this was done, those rules were almost useless. In the more modern grammars of Germany, the analogy is first taught, and then the nouns are divided into a number of declensions. But this seems to be labour thrown away; for, if the Student is once made acquainted with the laws of syllabication, and the forms of words, any further classification of these forms, must rather tend to confuse him than the contrary. But, supposing this not to be the case, still the labour is multiplied; and, as far as I can see, for no useful purpose.

I was agreeably surprised to find, upon turning over the Rabbinic grammars of D. Kimchi and those who have followed him, that under the forms of the nouns, the changes of the vowel-points are in all cases given; which, indeed, had appeared to me the most rational way of proceeding. In conformity with this principle then, it is our intention to proceed to the classification of the nouns, beginning with those termed *Segolate*, giving at once all we believe to be necessary for the information of the Student, and adding such notes on the different forms as the circumstances of the case shall

seem to require. Having already given a classification of the Segolate nouns, we shall now proceed to exemplify them.

5th. *On the First Species of Segolate Nouns of the forms* פְּקָד, פִּקַד, *or* פֻּקָד.

Forms. Primitive.	Usual Do.	Examples.		Fem. Gen.	State of Construction. Masc.	Fem.
פְּקָד	פֶּקֶד	מֶלֶךְ	*a king.*	מַלְכָּה *a queen.*	מֶלֶךְ	מַלְכַּת
or, Alt.						
פִּקַד	פִּקַד	גְּבַר	*a man* (Chald. Syr.)	——	גְּבַר	none.
or						
פֻּקַד	פֻּקַד	כְּתָב	*a writing.*	——	כְּתָב	none.

6th, The *Absolute* masculine plurals (Art. 147. 3.) of all Segolate nouns, excepting those only which have (וֹ) *Khōlém* for one of their vowels, take the form of פְּקָדִים; feminines take that of פְּקָדוֹת. In the first case, therefore, we shall have מְלָכִים, and in the feminine מְלָכוֹת, from the alternate forms (Art. 156. 1.). And, so of all others, whether of the masculine or feminine gender, with the above exception. The plural form, as used in construction with another noun, as also in conjunction with any of the inseparable pronouns, will follow the primitive form of these words (Ib. 3.). In the words given above we shall have מַלְכֵי, and מַלְכוֹת, for the plural forms for construction. But, כְּתָב has כִּתְבֵי, and גְּבַר does not occur in the plural form for construction. It should be observed, however, that the Chaldaic and Syriac forms פִּקַד or פֻּקַד are to be referred, sometimes to one class, and sometimes to another, of the Segolate nouns: thus כְּתָב is manifestly of the class פְּקָד, the plural in construction being כִּתְבֵי; but כַּסַף belongs to פִּקַד, the plural of construction, no less than the forms found with the pronouns being כַּסְפּוֹ: as, כַּסְפּוֹ *his silver;* כַּסְפֵּיהֶם *their pieces of silver.*

7th, The regular forms, for the affixed pronouns, singular and plural of the first form, are, as מַלְכּוֹ, מַלְכְּךָ, מַלְכִּי, מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכֵיכֶם, מַלְכֵינוּ, מַלְכֶיהָ, and, by analogy, though not occurring in the text, מַלְכֶיהָ, מַלְכַי, &c. So that the plural of construction,—that used in connection with the pronouns of the second and third persons masculine and feminine plural, will be regulated by the primitive forms of these nouns; and in all other cases they will follow the alternate

form, פִּקֵּד, or פִּקֶּד, due regard being had to the laws of syllabication.

8th, זְמַן *time*, takes *Dāgésh* in the final נ when the word receives any asyllabic augment: as, זְמַנִּים *times*, זְמַנֵּיהֶם *their times*, &c. But this word probably belongs to some of the augmented forms.

9th, It should be remembered, that in every case in which a guttural letter is the second or third of such word, the accompanying or preceding vowel may be (-); as, זְרֹעַ *an arm* (Art. 114.). For a list of nouns of this form, see the "Arcanum Formarum" of Simonis, p. 307, &c.

10th, It should also be observed, that some Segolate nouns are, in their original forms, of the feminine gender: and, that, generally, words do not receive the termination ־ָה as distinctive of that gender, except such as relate to sex.

11th, There is a considerable number of defective forms, which may be referred to the *Segolates*, of which the following belong to this class in particular: מָוֶת *death* (prim. מָוֶת, Art. 114.), which in construction, or with the pronouns, will take the form מוֹת (Art. 151. 6.): as, מוֹת הַיָּלֶד *the death of the child*, Gen. xxi. 16. So מוֹתָיו, &c.; מוֹתָהּ, מוֹתָם, &c., and in the plural number מוֹתָיו, &c.; עָוֶל *iniquity*, fem. עַוְלָה *id.* and contr. עוֹלָה; דּוֹר *an age, generation* (prim. דָּוְרָ, Arab. دَوْر Art. 93.)

12th, Examples with a medial י: צַיִד (prim. צַיְדָ, Arab. صَيْد) *hunting*, fem. צֵידָה *id.* (Art. 93. 3.); בַּיִת (prim. בַּיְתָ, Arab. بَيْت), in constr. בֵּית, with pron. בֵּיתוֹ, בֵּיתִי, &c. (Art. 151—6.). The plural now in use, viz. בָּתִּים, is evidently derived from another primitive.

Of Nouns doubling the last radical letter:—גַּן *a garden* (prim. גַּנָּן, by Art. 83.) fem. גַּנָּה *id.* (Ib.) And, with the pronouns, גַּנִּי, גַּנּוֹ, &c. plur. abs. גַּנִּים for גַּנָּנִים, and fem. גַּנּוֹת for גַּנָּנוֹת, in order perhaps to avoid the too frequent recurrence of the same sound. The form of construction taken by the feminine is גִּנַּת, instead of גַּנַּת, probably for the sake of variety. So בַּר *pure* (prim. בַּרְרָ Arab. بَرّ): fem. בָּרָה, for בַּרְרָה (Art. 115.) *purity*. In the plur. constr. masc. בָּרֵי for בַּרְרֵי.

—With medial ו and final א:—שָׁוְא, prim. form, and, by apocope שָׁו (Art. 80.) *vanity*; fem. שׁוֹאָה *destruction*. So with י, גַּיְא prim. form, *a valley*. In constr. גֵּיא, and, by apocope גֵּי, also in construction, גֵּי; pl. גֵּאָיוֹת, and with the light affixes, גֵּיאוֹתֶיךָ *thy vallies*.

—With final ו or י:—עַד (prim. עַדְוְ or עַדְיְ) *eternity*; so אָחוּ for אָחְוְ (Art. 93. 2.) *a bulrush*; שָׂחוּ *swimming*.

—With medial נ:—אַף for אַנְפְ (Art. 82.) *the nose, anger*; with the pronouns, אַפּוֹ, אַפְּךָ, אַפִּי, pl. אַפָּיו, אַפֶּיךָ, &c.; and in constr. אַפֵּי. The absolute form of the plural does not occur: but, in the dual we have אַפַּיִם, which would have the same form, in constr. and with the pronouns, with those given above.

For further examples of this kind, the Student is referred to the "Arcanum Formarum" of Simonis, sectio v. throughout.

157. *Of the Second Species of Segolate Nouns.*

Forms.		Examples.		In Construction.	
Prim.	Usual Do.		Fem. Form.	Masc.	Fem.
פֶּקֶד	פֶּקֶד	חֶלֶד *an age.*	חִבְרָה *society.*	חֶלֶד	חִבְרַת
פֶּקֶד	פֶּקֶד	שֶׁכֶם *a shoulder.*	——	שְׁכֶם	——

Nouns of this species occur but rarely: and it is doubtful whether the last of these does not more properly belong to the primitive form פֶּקֶד, as we have it with the pronouns שִׁכְמִי, שִׁכְמְךָ, &c. But, as a proper name (as some think) with the local ־ָה we have שֶׁכְמָה *towards Shechem*, Hos. vi. 9.

In the first example, we have חֶלְדִּי, &c. with the pronouns.

158. *Of the Third Species.*

Forms.		Examples.			In Construction.	
Primitive.	Usual Do.			Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
פֶּקֶד	פֶּקֶד & פֶּקֶד	נֵרְד *nard.*		——	נֵרְד	——
		חֵלֶד *a portion.*	חֶלְקָה *id.*		חֵלֶק	חֶלְקַת
	פֶּקֶד	חֶבֶל *vanity.*	שְׁאֵרָה *kin.*		חֶבֶל	שַׁאֲרַת

The absolute form of the plural is here, as before, פְּקָדִים masc. and פְּקֻדוֹת fem.: as, חֲלָקִים, but חֲלָקוֹת does not occur. So חֲבָלִים *pains*; חֶבֶל *vanity*, חֲבָלִים *vanities*, and so of others. The pronouns are affixed thus: חֶלְקוֹ *his portion*; חֶלְקִי *my portion*; חֶלְקָם *their portion*. So fem. חֶלְקָהּ, חֶלְקָתִי, חֶלְקָתָם, &c. חֶבֶל pl. in constr. is חִבְלֵי: of חֶבֶל, חִבְלִי, &c.

חַטָּא *sin*, is with the pronouns חַטָּאוֹ, חַטָּאָם, &c. In the plur. abs. חַטָּאִים, constr. חַטָּאֵי: with the pronouns, חַטָּאַי, חַטָּאֵינוּ, חַטָּאֵיכֶם, &c. and so on.

The nouns of this species are numerous. The following are a few examples: חֵפֶץ *will, delight;* עֵדֶן *pleasure,* also the proper name of a place; חֶשֶׁב *a girdle;* חֶלֶב *fat.* But שֵׁבֶט *a rod;* מֵצַח *the forehead;* שֵׂכֶל *understanding, acuteness,* with some others, take the pronouns, &c. after the form פִּקְדָּ: as, שִׁבְטוֹ *his rod;* מִצְחוֹ *his forehead;* שִׂכְלוֹ *his understanding.* So עֲקֵב, which also occurs of the form עֲקֶב, we have עֲקֵבוֹת *thy vestiges,* Jer. xiii. 22; and, in construction in the feminine gender עִקְּבוֹת: but these may, perhaps, be derived from different primitives.

2d, The following are a few of the defective nouns, which seem to belong to this species: גֵּז a *fleece;* (prim. גֵּזֵז Art. 83.), fem. גִּזָּה for גִּזָּהּ, constr. גִּזַּת, masc., in constr. גִּזֵּי *cuttings;* גֵּרָה *the cud* (prim. גֵּרֵר); חֵךְ *the palate* (prim. חֵכֵךְ, Art. 82.), with the pronouns חִכִּי, חִכֵּךְ, חִכָּם, &c. For further examples, see the "Arcanum Formarum," p. 326, &c.

3d, Chaldaic and Syriac words often occur of the form פִּקְדָּ: as, כִּסְפָּ, Heb. form כֶּסֶף *silver;* מִלְּתָ *counsel.* So, in Hebrew, שִׁאַת instead of שְׂאֵת *elevation.* See the "Arcanum Formarum," pp. 309, 310.

Of the Fourth Species of Segolate Nouns.

159. This, according to our arrangement, will comprehend all primitive nouns of the forms פִּקְדָּ, and פִּקֶד, but of the latter no examples occur.

Forms.		Examples.	In Construction.		
Primitive.	Usual.		Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
פִּקְדָּ	פֶּקֶד	כֶּבֶשׂ *a lamb.*	כִּבְשָׂהּ	כֶּבֶשׂ	כִּבְשַׂת
		יֶתֶר *excellence.*	יִתְרָהּ	יֶתֶר	יִתְרַת

2d, Here, as before, the plurals, &c. are regularly formed: as, pl. abs. masc. כְּבָשִׂים, fem. כְּבָשׂוֹת, the pl. masc. of construction does not occur in this example: but, for the fem. we have כִּבְשׂוֹת. The only instance in which this word occurs with the pronoun is Job xxxi. 20, כִּבְשַׂי. So נֶדֶר *a vow;* צֶדֶק *justice, righteousness;* לֶקַח *learning;* בֶּטַח *confidence;* to which many more may be added. Of the Defective nouns, עִיר (עִיֵר) *a city,* pl. עָרִים for עֲיָרִים (Art. 79.); פִּי *the mouth* (prim. פִּהִי, the latter ה being dropped, Art. 80, and the first changed to י, Art. 86.). So, with the pronouns: פִּי for פִּיִי (Art. 81.) *my mouth;* פִּיךְ *thy mouth;* פִּיו *his mouth,* &c.: and, in the fem. plur. פִּיּוֹת *mouths,* and masc. פִּים. The Learner should be

informed, however, that it is often extremely difficult to say, to which of the forms such words as these belong; and, as it is not of very great importance to which they are attached, we shall on every occasion offer but a very few.

Of the Fifth Species.

160. These have the primitive forms פְּקֶדְ, and פִּקְדְ, and constitute a considerable class of Nouns in the Hebrew language.

Forms.		Examples.			In Construction.	
Primitive.	Usual Do.			Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
פְּקֶדְ	פִּקְדְ	קֹדֶשׁ *holiness.*		אָכְלָה *meat.*	קֹדֶשׁ	——
Also פִּקְדְ as		קִשְׁטְ and קֹשֶׁט *truth.*			*Id.*	——
פִּקְדְ	פִּקְדְ	קִשְׁט *Id.*		בְּאֹשׁ *stink.*	בְּאֹשׁ	——

2d, Of this last form, perhaps, no other word occurs, unless the Infinitives of the form פִּקְדְ are to be added: which, however, upon receiving one of other of the pronouns, assume the same form with the first, and which are never found in the plural number.

3d, The masculine plural of the first of these forms is regularly פְּקָדִים: as, קָדָשִׁים, the substitute for *Shĕvá* preserving the original vowel of the word. In the plural of construction, we have קָדְשֵׁי; and with the pronouns singular and plural, קָדְשִׁי, קָדְשׁוֹ, &c.; pl. קָדָשֶׁיךָ, קָדָשָׁיו, קָדְשֵׁיכֶם, קָדְשֵׁיהֶם, &c. all regularly formed. In the word רֹאשׁ (for רֹאְשׁ), we have in the plural רָאשִׁים and רָאשֵׁי, for רָאָשִׁים and רָאְשֵׁי, by Art. 79, א being preserved to avoid ambiguity. With the pronouns רֹאשִׁי (for רָאְשִׁי), on account of the concurrence of א with the preceding vowel (Art. 93. 5.), רֹאשְׁכֶם, רֹאשְׁךָ, &c. The same form prevails in the plural with the pronouns: as, רָאשָׁיו, רָאשֵׁיכֶם, &c. In some instances קֹדֶשׁ is thought to take the same plural form: as, קָדָשִׁים, קָדָשַׁי, &c. for קָדָשִׁים, &c. But in these cases, the primitive may have been of a different form: if not, this word is occasionally anomalous, or erroneously written. So, שָׂרֹשׁ *a root*, שָׂרָשִׁים, שָׂרָשָׁיו, &c.; but in construction שָׂרְשֵׁי: גֹּרֶן *a threshing floor*, fem. makes its abs. pl. גְּרָנוֹת for גְּרָנֹות by a similar anomaly: and, in the pl. of con-

struction we have גְּרָנוֹת. From גֹּדֶל we also have גָּדְלוֹ *his greatness;* from קֹמֶץ, קָמְצוֹ *his handful.*

4th, When the middle letter happens to be a guttural (ּ) becomes (־) (Art. 114.): as, תְּאַר *form;* בְּחַק *a pustule,* &c., while in some instances (ּ) remains: as, אֹהֶל *a tent;* בֹּהֶן *the thumb.*

5th, In some instances also, *Khōlém* remains in the abs. pl.: as, אֹהָלִים; as also in those which have not the grave suffixes: as, אָהֳלָיו, אָהֳלֶיךָ; but, in construction, and with the grave suffixes, the first vowel is *Kāméts Khātúph*: as, אָהֳלֵי, אָהֳלֵיכֶם, &c., which are regular. D. Kimchi takes it to be *Kāméts.**

6th, בֹּהֶן *the thumb,* fem. forms the plural בְּהֹנוֹת; but does not occur with any of the pronouns. In the same manner are formed the plurals of לֹבֶן *splendour,* and נֹכַח *front, presence:* as, נְגֹהוֹת and נְכֹחוֹת; but these, according to D. Kimchi, belong to some other form of the singular (perhaps נְגֹהָה, בְּהֹן, &c.): as, נְכֹחָה Amos iii. 10.

7th, There are a few peculiarities in the word בְּאֹשׁ *ill savour;* which deserve notice. Its original form seems to be בְּאָשׁ; but, with the pronouns it is written בְּאֹשׁוֹ, בְּאֹשָׁם, &c. in which the *o* is drawn back (Art. 93. 5.). In the time of Kimchi, however, it was written בְּאָשׁוֹ, בְּאָשָׁם, with a quiescent א, which inclined him to think, that the singular form must have been בְּאָשׁ.

8th, In those cases in which the last letter is a guttural in this form, the sound of *o* is lost: as, רֹמַח *a spear,* pl. רְמָחִים: but, with a pronoun it returns: as, רָמְחֵיהֶם *their spears;* אֹרַח *a way,* makes אָרְחוֹת pl. abs., but in construction אָרְחוֹת.

9th, Of the defective nouns, we have תֹּהוּ for תֹּהוֹ *emptiness* (Art. 93. 2.); בֹּהוּ for בֹּהוֹ, *vanity;* מָרֻּה for מָרֹרָה fem. *bitterness;* to which many others may be added.

10th, These nouns are, for the most part, abstracts as to sense

---

* Michlol, fol. רז, verso, which, according to him, is always the case when a guttural letter occupies the place of the second radical: as in אָהֳלֵי אֱדוֹם *the tents of Edom,* Ps. lxxxiii. 7; גְּאֳלֵי הַכְּהֻנָּה *the defilings of the priesthood,* Neh. xiii. 29; תְּאֳמֵי צְבִיָּה *twin roes,* Cant. vii. 5; but תְּאוֹמֵי Ib. iv. 5, is, he thinks, derived from a different primitive. I believe, however, that in the above cases, (ה) is *Kāméts Khātúph,* and if so, there is no irregularity.

(Art. 154. 8.): and, in many instances, where they appear not to be so, some translated sense takes its place: as, מֶלֶךְ *king*, which originally meant *possession*, *dominion*, or the like; but which, in process of time seems to have lost its primitive application. Perhaps it still retains that sense in Proverbs xiv. 28.

בְּרֹב־עָם הַדְרַת־מֶלֶךְ וּבְאֶפֶס לְאֹם מְחִתַּת רָזֹון׃

"In the multitude of people is the glory of rule;
But in the diminution of a nation is the stroke of poverty."

In this case מֶלֶךְ is opposed to רָזֹון, which seems to me to prove, that *rule* or *dominion* is the sense in which it must be taken. Some, indeed, have proposed to read רֹזֵן *prince*, at the end of the second hemistich: but, this will be unnecessary, when we restore מֶלֶךְ to its primitive signification. In the same manner, the word سلطان, which means *power*, *rule*, or the like, has been applied to the Emperor of Constantinople: and, in our own language, we use *Justice*, *Magistrate*, *Lordship*, and many similar expressions, which were originally abstract nouns.

On the Forms of those Primitive Nouns which are not Segolate.

161. Having given the different forms and inflections of the primitive nouns which have been termed *Segolate*, we now come to those which are also primitive, but which have not that peculiarity of punctuation which is found to prevail in them; and which, moreover, have the accent on the last syllable: and, as it will not be necessary, in all cases, to give the forms of the plurals—of the noun when in construction, or when in connection with the pronouns, we shall only point out those instances in which any difficulty may arise, either from a vowel being immutable, or any other cause; which is all the Learner can want. The following are the forms peculiar to this species of nouns: viz. I. פָּקֵד, fem. פְּקֵדָה: II. פָּקֵד, fem. פְּקֻדָּה: III. פָּקֵד, fem. פְּקֻדָּה: IV. פָּקֵד, fem. פְּקֵדָה: V. פָּקִיד, fem. פְּקִידָה: VI. פָּקִיד,

fem. פְּקִידָה: VII. פָּקוּד, fem. פְּקוּדָה: VIII. פְּקוּד, fem. פְּקוּדָה: IX. פּוֹקֵד, fem. פּוֹקְדָה and פּוֹקֶדֶת: X. פָּקוֹד, fem. פְּקוֹדָה: XI. פִּקֹּוד, fem. פִּקֹּודָה, and once פִּקֹּודִית, which is perhaps a compound form. A few other feminine forms occur, which will be given in their places.

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
I.	פְּקֻד	פְּקֻדָה	יְקָר *value.*	וְקָרָה *id.*
II.	פָּקֻד	פְּקֻדָה	דָּבָר *a word.*	צְדָקָה *righteousness.*
		or, פְּקֻדַּת		עָתֶרֶת *abundance.*

2d, As the last example exhibits the form generally used in construction, nothing further need be said about it. In the first two, we have no vowel which can be said to be *immutable.* The plurals, therefore, and pronouns, will take those forms which a regard to the vowels and accents would suggest as proper: as, דָּבָר, in constr. דִּבַר: with the pronouns דְּבָרוֹ, דְּבָרִי, &c., pl. abs. דְּבָרִים, in constr. דִּבְרֵי (for דִּבְרֵי, Art. 112.): with pron. דִּבְרֵיהֶם, דִּבְרֵיכֶם, &c.: with an asyllabic pron. דִּבְרֵי, דִּבְרֵיהוּ, &c. throughout. The same will hold good in all similar forms, in which the vowels are by analogy mutable.

3d, In some instances the first (ר) is *immutable,* but then it is believed to occupy the place of א: as, פָּרָשׁ *a horseman;* Arab. فَارِسٌ; pl. פָּרָשִׁים.

4th, Nouns of these forms are generally Concrete, and may designate substances: as, אָדָם *a man;* בָּרָד *hail;* בָּשָׂר *flesh:* epithets; as, חָכָם *a wise man;* רָשָׁע *a wicked man.** In some cases they seem to be abstract: as, בְּכָא *weeping;* זְעָקָה *crying out,* &c.; but this may

* Whether the Hebrews ever considered words of this kind as adjectives, as we do, I very much doubt. But, whatever may be said on this subject, it is much more convenient, in considering the structure of this language, to treat them as epithets, including a substantive with their attributive properties, as in the English word *fool,* &c. See the Syntax.

take place by the operation of a metonymy, just as the contrary effect sometimes takes place in the Segolates (Art. 160. 10.).

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
III.	פְּקֶד	פְּקֻדָּה or פְּקֻדַּת	גָּדֵר *a fence.*	גְּדֵרָה or גְּדֵרַת *id.*
			גָּזֵל *stolen.*	גְּזֵלָה *id.*
IV.	פִּקֵּד	פְּקֻדָּה or פְּקֻדַּת	יְלֵל *howling.*	אֲפֵלָה *darkness.*
				עֲצֵלַת *idleness.*
		once פְּקֻדוּת		כְּבֵדוּת *heaviness.*

5th, In these forms, which are nearly related to each other, the second vowel is generally *immutable*, the first not so: as, גְּדֵרוֹ *his fence*; גְּדֵרֵךְ *thy* (fem.) *fences*; גְּדֵרֶיהָ *her fences*, pl. fem.; גְּדֵרוֹת *fences*. This being known, the vowels proper for construction, &c. are also known. In a few instances we have a י inserted: as, זְעֵיר *littleness*; שְׁלֵיו *tranquillity*; פְּלֵיטָה *escape*, which seems to account for the attendant vowels being immutable: as also to suggest that some affinity exists between this and the next form, which is perhaps the case.

6th, The signification peculiar to these forms, is that of *habit, custom, passion*, whence they have by some been termed participles. Those of the third are found in words signifying *feeling, perception*, or the like, and are often used as roots of verbs having this sense: as, חָפֵץ *willing*; שָׂמֵחַ *rejoicing*, and the like.

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
V.	פָּקִיד	פְּקִידָה	נָבִיא *a prophet.*	נְשִׁיקָה *a kiss.*
VI.	פְּקִיד	*id.*	נָסִיךְ *a libation.*	עֲלִילָה *an action.*
VII.	פָּקוּד	פְּקוּדָה	לָמוּד *learned.*	לְמוּדָה *id.*
VIII.	פְּקוּד	*id.*	נָדוּד *boasting.*	נְבוּאָה *prediction.*
		or פְּקֻדַּת		אֱמֶת *truth*, def. for אֱמֶנֶת.

7th, In all these cases the י and ו inserted are *immutable*, the other vowel is not: the plurals, &c. are, therefore, formed accordingly. In

some instances the וֹ or וּ will be omitted, and their places supplied by (ֹ) or (ֻ) respectively; in all which these vowels will remain *immutable*, for the purpose of preserving the original form of the word: as, חָשֵׁךְ masc. חֲשֵׁכָה fem. *darkness*. So עֵצָה fem. for יְעֵצָה *advice* (Art. 82.); so of פְּקֻדָּה *a visitation, being visited*, &c.

8th, Forms V. and VI. are very nearly allied to the foregoing both in form and signification: and from these, the forms VII. and VIII. scarcely present a shade of difference.* Simonis, indeed, makes a difference; but it is perhaps only imaginary. To the two last he ascribes the sense of past time, as if the action, of which this form is usually said to be the object, took place at some distant period: but, innumerable instances may be pointed out, in which it has a present or a future signification according to the context. The truth seems to be, that each of them imply habit, custom, &c. of the action, &c. which the root may signify: but, that in some roots, the one form is found to prevail, in others, the other.

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
IX.	פּוֹקֵד	פּוֹקֶדֶת	יוֹרֵד *descending.*	יוֹרֶדֶת *id.*
		פּוֹקֶדֶת		יוֹרֶדֶת *id.*
X.	פָּקוֹד	פְּקוּדָה	גָּדוֹל *great.*	גְּדוֹלָה *id.*
		or פְּקֻדָּה	עָנוֹג *luxurious.*	עֲנֻגָּה *id.*
XI.	פְּקוֹד	פְּקוֹדָה	זְרוֹעַ *the arm.*	בְּשׂוֹרָה *good news.*
		once פְּקוֹדִית		צְלוֹחִית *a sort of dish.*

9th, In these forms וֹ *Khōlém* only is *immutable*. We shall have, therefore, in the plural, &c. פּוֹקְדִים masc. פּוֹקְדוֹת fem., and גְּדוֹלִים masc. גְּדוֹלוֹת fem. which will also be the forms proper for the state of construction, and for the pronominal affixes.

---

* So אָסִיר and אָסוּר *bound, a captive;* בָּחִיר and בָּחוּר *chosen;* יָלוּד and יָלִיד *born, a son;* מָשִׁיחַ and מָשׁוּחַ *anointed Messiah.* And, in a great number of cases, in which the textual reading has the one form, the marginal reading will have the other.

10th, Of these forms, like the preceding, nouns may be found both abstract and concrete, signifying habit or custom, but they seldom have a passive signification; פֹּקֵד with its feminine is generally used as an agent. Sometimes the feminine occurs: as, פּוֹרִיָּה *fructifera:* this, however, is rare.

LECTURE VII.

OF THE AUGMENTED HEBREW NOUNS.

162. HAVING considered the primitive nouns of both kinds, we now proceed to the augmented ones, which may be classed under four heads. I. Those which are found to double any letter or syllable, and may be termed *reduplicated nouns*. II. Those which are augmented by one or more of the letters contained in the technical word הָאֲמַנְתִּי *I have believed*, reduplicating, or not, at the same time, any of their letters or syllables. III. Nouns compounded of two or more others, each of which may be otherwise augmented, or not: and, IV. Foreign words.

2d, It is a maxim laid down by the Arabian grammarians, that whenever any addition is made to a word, some modification is made in its sense. This is conformable enough to the nature of things; for, unless some change were intended to be made, to make any such addition would be futile and unnecessary. So far, we are sure we must be right. The great difficulty, however, is, in determining the law by which this process of augmentation has been carried on; and thence ascertaining, what is the precise force of every form thus modified: and, it must be confessed, that although there is a considerable number of instances occurring in most languages in which we can clearly perceive a peculiar sense attendant on certain specific forms; yet, there are others, in which no such sense is discoverable: others again, in which one form is used for another, and even different forms linked together in the same phrase, or corresponding to one another in the parallel parts of the same context. To this may be added the figures of speech, which exercise a very considerable influence on the signification of words, and conspire very much to disconcert both the Learner and the Learned in enquiries of this nature. Still, we must not throw away all the helps we have, merely because they will not conduct us to the knowledge of every thing: besides, further enquiry may throw much new, and even sufficient, light

on this subject. We shall, therefore, follow the course just marked out, in detailing the forms of augmented nouns.

3d, Writers on this subject seem to agree in the following principles, viz. That, by augmentation will generally be designated either *intensity*, *frequency*, *duration*, *defect*, or the like, of that *action*, *passion*, *habit*, &c. which is contained in the idea afforded by the primitive word:—that, in some instances, a word which is intransitive, will, by adding a letter, become transitive: as in the English words, *rise* and *raise*, which in Hebrew will be קָם (for קָנַם) and קוּם or קוֹמֵם. A similar effect is produced in Hebrew by prefixing a letter: as, הֵקִים which is also parallel to *raise*, the root being קוּם signifying *rise*. In many cases, however, as already remarked, the real force of the augment is not perceptible; and in these, we must be content to abide by usage. As we proceed, however, it is my intention to offer some conjectures on the origin of the different augments; and, should I not succeed to as great an extent as may be wished, I shall certainly gain my point in another respect, namely; by impressing upon the Learner's mind, the different forms with which he will meet. Besides, by the attempt to ascertain what these additional syllables really are, and what they mean, some light may be thrown on the manner in which language in general has been constructed. It is my belief, that language has grown up, in a great measure, out of necessity; and that words which now exceed their primitive length must have been made so by the addition of others qualifying or otherwise modifying their sense, as circumstances should require. In process of time, many of these additional words may have become attached to others, and so abbreviated as greatly to obscure their original forms and significations: e. g. The English word *attempting*, seems to be compounded of *at*, (*ad*, whatever that word was originally) *tempt*, and *ing*. The last component part is probably the same with the Latin *Ens*, or Greek ὤν, so that each part of the word originally stood singly, but is now so compounded as to stand for one. In such words as *incomprehensibility*, *transubstantiation*, &c., I suppose we have not fewer than five or six primitive words confounded together in one.

4th, The Greek and Latin prepositions, with which so many of their words are compounded, were, perhaps, at first significant words: and, it strikes me as most probable, that their terminations of case and gender, no less than the variations found to prevail in the conjugations of their verbs, were all, at some time, significant words, which have

been so attached to the root, as to supply the sense which these conjugations, &c. now bear. It may, indeed, be impossible now to ascertain exactly what they were; still, I think, the attempt to do so, could not but be attended with beneficial results.—But to proceed, the following tables will exhibit the forms with some examples of the first class of these nouns.

Of Reduplicated Words, Intensive, &c. in their Signification.

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
I.	פִּקֵּד	פִּקֵּדֶת	עִקֵּשׁ *very perverse.*	אִוֶּלֶת *great folly.*
or	פַּקֵּד	or בַּקֵּדֶת	אִלֵּם *quite dumb.*	וְקֵהָה *prompt obedience.*
		or פְּקֵדָה	לַמֵּד *teaching.*	נַבַּחַת *baldness.*

5th, To this form may be referred those nouns, which, on account of having ו or י for their middle radical letter, and therefore not convenient for reduplication (Art. 81.), double the last: as, שׁוֹקֵק *greatly desiring*, fem.; שׁוֹקֵקָה *id.*, root שׁוּק; עוֹלֵל *a sucking child*, root עול. The same form is also found in words derived from roots having the second and third radical letter the same: as, שׁוֹמֵם, fem. שׁוֹמֵמָה *desolate, desolation*, root שמם. The passive forms of these will be שׁוֹמַם, שׁוֹקַק, עוֹלַל, &c.

6th, The first vowel, in all these cases, is necessarily *immutable:* the last occasionally so. One vowel, therefore, is in the former, mutable, as in עִקֵּשׁ &c., pl. abs. עִקְּשִׁים, constr. עִקְּשֵׁי. The pronouns, therefore, will be fixed accordingly. Under this head may be placed all those verbal nouns, which are generally arranged as the infinitives, &c. of the *Pīḥél* conjugation.

7th, As this form is taken for the root of one of the species of the Conjugation, it is necessary that some account should be here given of its force.

It has been laid down as a rule, that verbs which are intransitive in the first species, are sometimes made transitive in this: as, לָמַד *he learned;* לִמֵּד *he taught.* The same property prevails in the Arabic: عَلِمَ *he knew;* عَلَّمَ *he taught.* This they call *the transitive* property; التَّعدِيَة. The other dialects also recognise this property.

8th, Another property is, the *becoming* either in *reality* or in *estimation* only, that which the primitive word signifies: as, בְּכַר *he became*, or was adopted as, *the first born*, from the primitive בְּכוֹר *first born*: but this word, when used of trees, as producing fruit, will mean *prematurity*.

Under this head may be placed those cases, in which is intimated *a Declaration, Announcement, Accusation*, &c. of what the primitive word signifies: as, טִמֵּא *pronouncing*, or *accusing another of being, unclean*; טִהֵר *pronouncing another clean*. So perhaps, חִטֵּא *pronouncing, confessing*, &c. *sin*. And hence by a metonymy, *expiating* it.* These properties are termed by the Arabian Grammarians, التَّحوُّل *changing*, and التَّسمِيَة *naming*: as, 1, روض المكان *the place became a garden*; قوس الرجل *the man became* BOWED, or *bent like a* BOW. Where the English word *bowed* is similarly formed from *bow*: 2, فسقت زيدا *I called Zaid wicked*, i. e. pronounced him to be so; كفر زيدا *he called Zaid an infidel*; تجبين *calling one a coward*, &c. Of this kind are אֶשְׁרוּנִי *they shall bless me*, Gen. xxx. 13; i. e. *they shall declare that I am blessed*; לֹא־יְנַקֶּה *he shall not make innocent*, i. e. *declare to be so*, Exod. xx. 7. The same may be said, in all those passages, given in this form, in which God is said to have *hardened* Pharaoh's heart. See Exod. iv. 21, ix. 12, x. 20. 27, &c., compared with Exod. vii. 13, 1 Sam. vi. 6, &c.

9th, Another property of this form is, to intimate, *Intensity, Abundance*, or *Frequency*, of the action or passion signified by the primitive word: שָׁבַר *he broke*; שִׁבֵּר *he broke to pieces*; צָמַח *it shot up, grew*; צִמַּח *it shot up quickly and abundantly*. Equivalent to this, is the property termed المبالغة or كثرة of the Grammarians of Arabia, which is said to accompany this form: as, حمدة *he praised him very*

---

* This property is termed by the Arabic Grammarians سلب *deprivation*: as, جلدته *I skinned him*, or *deprived him of his skin*. Lumsden's Arab. Gram. p. 178. See also his Pers. Gram. vol. i. p. 230.

much; جَوَّلَ *he exercised his horse very much;* صَرَّحَ الحَقُّ *the truth became very apparent,* &c.

10th, In a few instances also, this form is thought to have a causative signification: as, הָלַךְ *he walked;* הִלֵּךְ *he caused another to walk,* &c.

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
II.	פָּקֻד	פְּקוּדָה	חָבוּק *embracing.*	בְּכוֹרָה *first-born.*
or	פַּקּוּד	or פַּקּוּדָה	אַשּׁוּר *marching.*	חֲבוּרָה *the cicatrix of a wound.*
			שַׁכּוּל *bereaved.*	שַׁכּוּלָה *id.*

11th, The vowels will in every case here be immutable; the plurals, &c. will therefore be regularly formed, פְּקוּדִים, פַּקּוּדִים, &c.

To this form are referred some words having ◌ִי between the first and second radical letters, which is thought to be a mere compensation for the omission of *Dāgésh*: as, כִּידוֹן *a spear;* כִּידוֹר *invasion;* צִינוֹק *a fetter;* and, according to some, שִׁילֹה *Shiloh.*

	Forms.		Examples.
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.
III.	פָּקִיד	—	אַסִּיר *firmly bound.*
			בָּרִיחַ *extremely fugitive* (Art. 115.).

12th, Here, as before, the vowels are *immutable.* No feminine form occurs.

	Forms.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
IV.	פַּקֵּד	פַּקֵּדָה, פַּקֶּדֶת,	אִכָּר *a farmer.*	שַׁלֶּטֶת *a ruler.*
or	פָּקֵד	פִּקֵּדָת or פַּקֵּדָת	גַּנָּב *a thief.*	בַּקֶּרֶת *enquiry.*
			חַטָּא *a sinner.*	חַטָּאָה *id.*
				פַּצֶּרֶת *sterility.*

13th, These nouns imply *habit* and the like, and are used to designate trades, professions, &c.*

14th, Both vowels are, here, necessarily *immutable*, the first on account of the syllabication, the second, because it seems to supply the place of א, by analogy: as, חָרָשׁ *an artificer* (Art. 161. 3.), pl. חָרָשִׁים, and in construction חָרָשֵׁי *artificers*; מַלָּח *a mariner*, pl. מַלָּחִים, with pron. מַלָּחֵיהֶם *their mariners*. A few instances occur in which (ֵ) occupies the place of (-) or (.): as, בֶּהָלָה and בַּלָּהָה *perturbation*. To the feminine forms Simonis adds פַּקָדוּת, of which two examples only occur, viz. חַלָּמוּת *coagulated milk*, according to him, Job vi. 6; and פַּלָּצוּת *terror*, Ib. xxi. 6, &c. But these are probably *compound* forms.

	Form.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
V.	פָּקֵד	פְּקֵדֶת	לָמֵד *trained, accustomed.*	כֻּסֶּמֶת *spelt* (herb).
		פְּקוּדֶת	—	כֻּתֹּנֶת *a coat.*
		פְּקֻדָּה rarely.		לְקֻחָה *taken.*

15th, Simonis places יוּלַד Judg. xiii. 8, under this form: but nothing can be more probable than that this is the third person of the verb, construed with ה in the sense of אֲשֶׁר, and to be understood as a future tense; e. g. הַיּוּלַד *who should be born*. And, perhaps, this word does not occur, construed as a simple noun, in any case.

16th, Under this head may be classed all those nouns which are generally arranged as infinitives of the *Pūḥál* conjugation, and which may, therefore, be considered as passives corresponding with the active forms, פָּקֵד, &c.

17th, In all these cases, the first vowel is necessarily immutable;

---

* The same forms have the same force in Arabic: as, عطّار *a perfumer*, خبّاز *a baker*; from عطر *perfume*, and خبز *bread*. So in Syr. and Chaldaic ומרא Chald. זַמָּרָא *a singer*, &c.

the last not so universally: but, as examples do not occur sufficiently numerous to decide this question, we can say but little about it.

18th, These forms are thought to be intensitive of those given under the preceding class (Art. 161.): but, whether such signification is always to be found in the places where they occur, is doubtful.

Of those Nouns which are said to be reduplicated by implication (Art. 115.).

163. These are nouns which are thought to have an intensitive signification, without presenting any reduplication either in the vowels or consonants: but, as they generally have a perfect vowel, occasionally immutable, in the penultimate, it has been thought, that this has been supplied as a compensation for the *Dagesh* which has been omitted. The following are their forms:

	Form.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
I.	פִּקֵּד,	פִּקֵּדָה,	נֵכֶר *unknown.*	צַלָּחָה *a dish.*
	or פִּיקֵּד	——	הֵיכָל *a temple.*	——

2d, For further examples see the Arcan. Form. p. 202, &c.

	Form.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
II.	פּוֹקֵד	פּוֹקֵדָה	עוּגָב *a musical instrument* so called.	
		or פּוֹקֵדֶת	סוּגָר *a fetter.*	אֲרִיָה *a stable, stall,* &c.
				מוֹעֶדֶת *vacillating.*

	Form.		Examples.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
III.	פּוֹקֵד	פּוֹקֵדָה	אֹהֶל *a tent.*	
		or פּוֹקֵדֶת	אוֹצָר *a treasure.*	
			חוֹתָם *a seal.*	חוֹתֶמֶת *a seal.*
				pl. טוֹטָפוֹת *frontlets.*

3d, With respect to the inflection of these words, it may be remarked, that the perfect vowel (ֵ) in the first form, sometimes remains immutable, at others not so. No rule, therefore, can be given, upon which reliance, as to the plurals, &c., can be placed. With respect to the other forms, whenever the ֹ or ֻ remains, its vowel also remains unchangeable; but when it drops, the defect may be compensated by inserting the point *Dāgésh* in the following consonant, as it is the case in the feminine פְּקֻדָּה, in which the perfect vowel is supplied by its corresponding imperfect one; e. g. for פּוּקְדָה, we have פְּקֻדָּה. So also, *vice versa*, letters doubled by the insertion of *Dagesh*, frequently lose this point, and then the preceding imperfect vowel changes into its correspondent perfect one. Hence it is, that these forms are supposed to contain an implicit reduplication, or in other words, to be forms equivalent to those which have the middle radical letter doubled by a *Dāgésh forte*.

But, as the nouns of this class are few, it is scarcely possible to glean from the usage of the language, what vowels are mutable and what are not so. For the same reason, it is impossible even to say, whether we are right in our classification of them, or not.

On the Augmented Nouns, termed הֶאֱמַנְתִּי *Hē-emanti.*

164. In nouns of this description, one or more of the letters contained in the technical word הֶאֱמַנְתִּי will be found attached to one or other of the preceding primitive or augmented forms, apparently for the purpose of varying the signification. That these are fragments of words we have no doubt: but, what they originally were, it may now be exceedingly difficult to say. We may, perhaps, be excused, if we offer a few conjectures on this subject, hoping, that although we may not succeed to the extent that may be wished, we shall nevertheless afford something, likely to fix these forms more permanently in the mind of the Learner: and this is our principal object.

2d, Of these letters (viz. הֶאֱמַנְתִּי) א, ה, י, מ, or ת, may be found at the beginning of words; while ה, י, ם,

ן, or ת, may be placed at the end. In some instances, words are augmented by one or more of these letters, both at the beginning and the end at the same time, having also the middle radical letter doubled by the operation of *Dāgésh forte,* as in the Participial forms of *Hithpāḥél,* מִתְפַּקֵּדִים and מִתְפַּקְּדוֹת, &c.

Of the Letters termed הֶאֱמַנְתִּי *viz.* א, י, ה, מ, נ, ת, *and* הת, *when prefixed to words.*

165. Simonis* considers nouns having א or י prefixed, as having some affinity in signification to those persons of the verbs which have these letters as preformatives; and the last, ת, as being nearly allied to the *Hithpāḥél* conjugation. This may be very true: but, as it leaves these conjugations, &c. unexplained, I have thought it would be better, to consider the force of these adjuncts in the nouns: because, if we can succeed in this, we shall have no difficulty whatever when we come to the verbs.

I suppose, then, that the letters ה, י, ת, or הת, are nothing more than abbreviated forms of primitive words, which might have originally been written in full and placed before others, in order to modify their sense. These, in process of time, might have lost some of their letters, and then have been compounded with others in the form we now have them. If, therefore, we can now find words which, according to the rules of the Grammar, may be thus abbreviated when joined with others, and giving the significations which such augmented forms seem to have, we shall perhaps make this subject more intelligible and interesting than it is usually found to be.

2d, With respect to the first, א, with which we may join ה, we perhaps have a fragment of the root אָהַן (Arabic هَوِيَ) *desiring, impelling, casting down,* and the like; to which, הָוָה and اوي, as expressing certain affections of the mind, may perhaps be added, as cognate roots. Upon this supposition הַפְקִיד, or אַפְקִיד, for the Chaldee or Syriac form, will stand for אָוָה, הָוַי, or הָוָה, פְּקִיד (Form VI. Art. 161.) *impelling, causing, desiring,* &c. another,

* Arcanum Formarum, p. 522.

to visit, &c. So אַכְזָב *a willing*, or *great, liar*; אַכְזָר *willingly*, or *greatly cruel.**

3d, We may now enter on the signification of words thus augmented: and, as some of them are taken as roots for a certain species of the conjugation of verbs, it will be as well now to determine their properties.

4th, If, then, the primitive word have an active sense, as, שָׁמַע *he heard*, it will in this form have a causative one; as, הַשְׁמִיעַ *causing to hear*: but, if the primitive be neuter, this form will be active in signification: as, עָמַד *he stood*; הֶעֱמִיד *he set up*; שָׂמַח *he was glad*; הִשְׂמִיחַ *he rejoiced another*.†

5th, If, in the next place, the primitive be a noun substantive or adjective, it will, in this form, signify the *being, making, becoming, doing, suffering, permitting*, &c. the sense of the root: הִבְרִיא *he made fat*, root בָּרִיא *fat*

---

* It is remarkable, that the causative and other verbs in the Coptic are formed in the same manner. "Verba composita," says Scholz. Gram. Copt. §. 86. e duabus vocibus coalescunt. In compositione verbum ⲉⲣ esse, vel facere, ϣⲉⲙ suscipere, ⲫⲓ ferre, ⲍⲓ projicere, ϫⲉⲗⲗ invenire, ⲥⲓ accipere, ⲧ dare, sæpissime occurrunt: e. g. ⲉⲣⲟϩⲱⲓⲛⲓ lucere, ex ⲉⲣ et ⲟϩⲱⲓⲛⲓ lux . . . . ϣⲉⲛϫⲁⲕⲁⲍ pati, ex ϣⲉⲙ et ϫⲁⲕⲁⲍ dolor, ⲫⲓⲣⲡⲱⲟϩϣ curare, ex ⲫⲓ et ⲡⲱⲟϩϣ cura, ⲍⲓⲥⲉⲛⲧ fundare, ex ⲍⲓ et ⲥⲉⲛⲧ fundamentum, ϫⲉⲗⲗⲁⲕⲁⲧ intelligere, ex ϫⲉⲗⲗ et ⲕⲁⲧ intellectus., ⲥϣⲱⲓⲛⲓ pudefieri, ex ⲥⲓ et ϣⲓⲛⲓ pudor, ⲧⲱⲟϩ glorificare, ex ⲧ et ⲱⲟϩ gloria." In these cases the words prefixed have precisely the same power with those above proposed, and in one, viz. ⲍⲓ projicere, is very nearly allied both in sound and force to our א or ה, particularly in the *Hiphḥíl* form הַפְקִיד or אַפְקִיד, &c.

† These properties are also common to the Arabic: as, 1. حفر زيد نهرا *Zaid dug a canal*; احفرته نهرا *I caused him to dig a canal*; 2. بصر زيد *Zaid had the faculty of sight*; ابصرته *I saw him.*

(Form V. Art. 161.); הֵימִין *he used the right hand,* or *proceeded towards it;* noun, יָמִין *the right hand.* So הִשְׂמְאִיל *he used,* or *went towards, the left hand;* noun, שְׂמֹאל *the left hand;* הִמְטִיר *he caused rain;* noun, מָטָר *rain;* הִלְבִּין *he became white,* root לָבָן *white;* הִשְׁבִּיר *he permitted* (to purchase) *provision,* root שֶׁבֶר *provision;* הִשְׁאִיר *he permitted* (to) *remain,* root שְׁאָר *remnant.**

6th, Another property is that of *exhibiting, declaring,* or *esteeming,* the person or thing designated by such word, possessed of the sense afforded by the primitive: as, הִצְדִּיק *he declared,* or *esteemed another, just,* from צַדִּיק *just;* הִרְשִׁיעַ *he declared,* or *esteemed another, wicked,* from רָשָׁע *wicked.* So, in Arabic أَكْفَرْتُهُ *I called him an infidel;* أَخْطَأْتُهُ *I accused him of sin.*† To this property may be referred all those passages, in which this form is used, wherein God is said to have *hardened the heart, blinded the eyes, made the heart gross, deceived the people,* &c.—where nothing more than declaring this to be the case can be meant.‡

7th, Another property of this form is, *excess,* or *intensity,* of action, passion, &c. as given by the primitive word: as, הֶאֱדִים *he was very red.* So, in the Arabic, أَسْفَرَ الصُّبْحُ *the morning was very bright;* أَثْمَرَ النَّخْلُ *the palm tree bore much fruit.*

---

* See Deut. ii. 28, 1 Sam. xxv. 22, Ps. cxix. 31, Is. lxiii. 17. The properties are all peculiar to the analogous forms in Arabic: see Lumsden's Arabic Gram. p. 173, &c.

† Lumsden's Arab. Gram. p. 175.

‡ Exod. vii. 3, x. 1, Deut. ii. 30, Is. vi. 10, comp. with Matth. xiii. 15. This property Storr refers to the influence of a metonymy. Observ. pp. 24, 28, &c., which he thinks amounts to nothing more than *permission.* See also pp. 194—5—6.

8th, Many verbs, not used in the first species, have either a neuter or transitive signification in this form: as, הִשְׁכִּים *he rose early;* הִשְׁלִיךְ *he threw.* Sometimes they are both neuter and transitive: as, הֵקִיץ *he watched,* or *he roused up another;* הֵרִנִּין *he sang,* or *he stimulated another to sing.*

9th, Several of the properties belonging to this form are also common to that of פִּקֵּד, see Art. 162. 7.

10th, When the ה is prefixed with (ֲ) *Khātúph,* (ֳ), or (ֹ), the sense will be passive *of one or other of the above-mentioned* properties.*

11th, With respect to (י) prefixed to certain forms, it may perhaps be a fragment of the root יָאַה, Syr. ܝܳܐ or ܝܵܐ, Arab. يَيَّا, *decent, becoming, benign, beautiful, excellent, inviting one to rest,* &c., which, when compounded with any other word, may afford the sense of permanence, strength, excellency, or the like, which, Grammarians are generally agreed, is the force of words so combined. But, as no conjugation is grounded on this form, it will not be necessary to dwell very particularly on it.

12th, We now come to the forms having הת, את, or ת, prefixed. And here, as before, we take this to be derived from some word, which, when combined with any other, will give the modification of

---

* It will, perhaps, be difficult to assign a good reason for the adoption of this vowel in giving a passive signification to words in the Shemitic dialects. Nothing can be more certain, however, than, that this is the fact. And, hence, we not only have it in the passive conjugations of verbs both in the Hebrew and Arabic, but, it imparts a sort of passive, or rather habitual, signification to some verbs which are conjugated in the active form: as, יָכֹל *he was strong;* كَرُمَ *he was bountiful;* حَسُنَ *he was beautiful;* رَفُعَ *he was exalted.* So in nouns, פָּקוּד *visited,* i. e. habitually; صَبُورٌ *patient,* habitually, &c.

sense usually attributed to these forms. If then we take אָתָא Chald. or Heb. אָתָה *coming, arriving at*, as the primitive word, and suppose את, הת, or ת, to be a fragment of it, we shall have a particle, which, when prefixed to any word, will give generally a passive, or reciprocal, sense, which all are agreed is the import of this form: e. g. הִתְפַּקֵּד or אֶתְפַּקֵּד; the Chaldee form, or תפקד, will mean, *coming*, or, as we say in English, *becoming visited*, which will be either passive or reflective, &c., as the sense of the context shall require. So in Latin, *amatum iri*, in which the word *iri* is manifestly derived from the verb *Ire, to go*.

Properties of the Conjugations grounded on this Form.

13th, First, *to be*, or *become*, that which the primitive word signifies (which in Arabic is termed مُطَاوَعَةٌ *submission)*; as, הִתְנַבֵּל *he became polluted*; הִתְחַזֵּק *he became strong*; הִתְאַדֵּם *he became red*; or, if the context require it, *he made himself so*, reflectively, or, *was made so*, passively. So in Arabic, ادبته فتأدب *I corrected him, and he became corrected*, &c.* In the eighth

---

* Lumsden's Arabic Grammar, p. 182—"Submission." Or, as the Arabic Grammarians define it, حصول اثر الشيء عن تعلّق الفعل المتعدي نحو كسرت الزّجاج فانكسر ذلك الزجاج فان انكسار الزّجاج اثر قد حصل عن تعلّق الكسر الذي هو اثر الفعل المتعدّي i. e. The impression made upon any thing by the action of a transitive verb: as, *I broke the glass, and the glass became broken.* Now, the glass's *becoming broken*, expresses the impression made by the active verb *breaking*. — In the كتاب التّعريفات we have: المطاوعة هي حصول الاثر عن تعلّق الفعل المتعدّي بمفعوله نحو كسرت الاناء فتكسّر فيكون تكسّر مطاوعاً اي موافقاً لفاعل الفعل المتعدّي وهو كسرت لكنّه يقال لفعل يدلّ عليه مطاوع بفتح الواو تسميةً لشيء باسم متعلقه i. e. *Almotáwaat*, is the receiving of an impression from the operation of an active verb upon its

Arabic species, to which this is nearly allied, we have the same property: as, غممتهُ فاغتمّ *I grieved him, and he*

---

object: as, "*I broke the vessel, and it became broken.*" Here, *the becoming broken*, is the *Motáwaa;* i. e. that which accords with the agent of the transitive verb, which is here "*I broke.*" But, the verb to which reference is made is so called; i. e. مطاوع *motáwaa*, by a metonymy.

I have been the more particular in pointing out this distinction, because we shall have occasion to refer to it again: and because I think Mr. de Sacy has entirely misunderstood it. In his Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 104, we have the following note. "La verbe dont la signification est passive ou neutre, se nomme encore مُطاوِع, comme le dit Giggeius: et en effet, Beïdawi, sur le v. 4. de la surate 42 ou on lit تكاد السموات يتفطرن *peu s'en faut que les cieux ne se fendent*, ou *ne soient fendus*, dit: قرا البصريان وابو بكر بالنون والاول ابلغ لانه مطاوع فطر وهذا مطاوع فطر. "Les deux lecteurs de Basra et Abou-Becr lisent ينفطرن; mais la première leçon est plus énergique, parce que تفطر est le *passif* de فطر, et انفطر le *passif* de فطر.

Nothing, I think, can be less accurate than to class the term مُطاوِع with those of غير متعدّ, غير واقع, and لازم, as Mr. de Sacy has here done. All that Beidawi means, seems to be, that يتفطرن is more elegant than ينفطرن, because it is the مُطاوِع (see the definitions above) of فطر, not of فطر, as the other reading is.

The real difference between the verbs termed لازم, غير متعدّ, &c. is, that they always imply *habit*, *inseparable properties*, as, *beauty*, *deformity*, *colour*, &c.; whereas مُطاوَعة or مُطاوِع (qu. مطاوع?) signify the accidental in-

was grieved; لؤمة فالتئم *he reproached him vehemently, and he became reproached.*

14th, Secondly, To *feign,* or *pretend* to, *exhibit,* &c. that which the primitive word signifies: as, Josh. ix. 4, יְצַיָּרוּ *they feigned themselves to be messengers;* 2 Sam. xiii. 5. 6, הִתְחַל *he pretended to be sick;* Prov. xiii. 7, מִתְעַשֵּׁר *one boasting himself to be rich.* So, מִתְרוֹשֵׁשׁ *feigning himself to be poor;* תִּתְחַסָּד *thou shewest thyself gracious;* תִּתַּמָּם *thou shewest thyself perfect,* Ps. xviii. 26. And, in Arabic, تشبع* *he pretended satiety;* ترجلت المراة *the woman assumed the manners of a man.*

15th, Thirdly, *Frequency,* or *intensity,* of the action or passion meant by the primitive word: as, הִתְהַלֵּךְ *he walked about often,* or *continually;* הִתְחַנֵּן *he solicited a favour with great earnestness.* In Arabic تَشَجَّعَ *he persevered in shewing bravery;* تَحَلَّمَ *he persevered in acquiring mildness.* And in the eighth, اكتسب *he persevered in acquiring;* and, in the sense of earnest request, ايتجر *he demanded his hire.*

16th, Fourthly, In many instances, the sense is the same as it would be if the verb were used in the primitive form termed *Kal:* as, הִשְׁתַּמֵּר *he kept laws,*

---

fluence of any transitive verb exerted upon some object; which is the difference between the Hebrew forms פָּקוּד and נִפְקַד, as will be seen hereafter.

The real force, then, of this form will be best expressed by *made, became,* or the like: as, הֻחֲלַךְ *made to go;* נִפְקַד *became visited,* &c. This will lay the ground-work for the reciprocal sense, &c., the context always determining who is the agent.

* The fifth species which has often a passive sense; and constantly in the Ethiopic.

statutes, &c. This also, with many other properties unknown to the Hebrew, is found in the Arabic.

For the transpositions and other changes which take place in certain words, when augmented by the particles הת, or את, see Art. 89.

17th, Nouns which receive מ at the beginning, generally designate the *Instrument, Agent, Action, Passion, State*, or the like, by, or in, which the influence of any verb is exerted, suffered, &c. respectively: as, מַגְזֵרָה *an ax;* (root גָּזַר *cutting*); מִפְקֵד *one visiting;* מָקוֹם *a place* (root קוּם *standing*).

2d, With respect to the reason for this variation of signification, Grammarians are generally silent. Simonis has supposed it to be equivalent to that, which the preposition ב similarly situated would supply.* I may perhaps be excused if I offer a different solution. If we suppose, then, that the word originally prefixed was either מִי or מַן *who*, מָה or מֶה *which*, or *what*, as the sense may require, we shall have significations suitable to words of these forms, e. g. מִי פֹקֵד *he who visits*, or *is visiting;* and, striking out the י—, for the purpose of abridging the word, we shall have מְפֹקֵד as above. The same will be the case, if we take מַן פֹּקֵד, for then the נ will be lost by Art. 82. These then may be forms for agents, when the verb is transitive: and such are all the participial forms commencing with מ.

In the next place, if we take מָה or מֶה *that which*, &c., and prefix it, contracted as before, we shall have מַגְזֵרָה *an ax*, for מָה גְּזֵרָה *that which* (is a) *cutting*, &c. So מַעֲשֶׂה *a work*, for מָה עָשָׂה *that which* (is a) *doing;* and so of others.

18th, We now come to give some account of the prefix כ, and of the modification of sense which primitive words undergo, in consequence of its influence. And here, as before, we may, perhaps, be allowed to offer a conjecture, as to its origin. If, then, we take it as a defective form of some primitive word, appearing sometimes as הכ, at other times as כ only, we may suppose it to be derived from the root أَنَى, which, had it been preserved in the Hebrew, might have been

* Arcanum Formarum, p. 447.

written הָנָה, אָנָה, or אָנָא. The senses attributed to it by Castell, are, among others:—"*Ad extremum perfectionis terminum pervenit .... assecutus fuit*, seu *percepit*. IV. *Retinuit, detinuit, coercuit* .... V. *Lenitate, modestiâ et patientiâ usus fuit, &c.*" Supposing, then, this word, or any defective form of it, to be construed with any other, the sense of both taken together would, in general, give the force of the forms thus compounded, which we now proceed to consider. And, as this form of compound is often used as the leading word of one of the species of the conjugation, it becomes the more important to ascertain its properties.

19th, First Property. Primitive words receiving this particle have a passive sense; or, are made subject to the action implied by the primitive accidentally, but not habitually: in which respect they differ from words of the form פָּקוּד: as, עֵץ נִשְׁתָּל *a tree which has been planted:* but, עֵץ שָׁתוּל will mean, *a tree planted,* i. e. now growing in that state, watered, &c., but without reference to the act of planting, or the contrary. So, שָׂכוּר will mean, *an hireling;* but, נִשְׂכָּר *a person hired on any particular occasion.* So I understand Neh. vi. 12, 13, סַנְבַלַּט שְׂכָרוֹ: לְמַעַן שָׂכוּר הוּא *Sanballat had hired him, because he was an hireling;* and 1 Sam. ii. 5, שְׂבֵעִים בַּלֶּחֶם נִשְׂכָּרוּ *those who are* (habitually) *full, are* (occasionally) *hired for bread.*

This property is also common to the Arabic, and is termed by the Grammarians مطاوعة: as, بعثه فانبعث *he sent him, and he was sent;* اغلقته فانغلق *I shut it, and it was shut.* (See No. 13, above.)

This property of the Hebrew form (as a verb) was pointed out many years ago by Elias Levita, in a work of his entitled חַבָּחוּר; but, as he supposed it also to involve a preterite tense, Glassius and others very properly objected; and, the consequence has been, two distinct forms, viz. פָּקוּד, and נִפְקָד, have been confounded together; and, what is still worse, a tense has been ascribed to each,

which perhaps is more than can be proved of either of them in this language.

20th, Secondly. Words, receiving this augment subjecting them to the action implied by any primitive word, may, when the context requires it, be construed as having a *reciprocal sense*, or implying *possibility, capability, exhibition, propriety, affection*, or the like, of the action, &c. meant by the primitive: as, נִשְׁמַר *he guarded himself*, 2 Sam. xx. 10, Mal. ii. 15. To this property may be referred many passages, in which this form seems to have a neuter signification; as, נִקְרַב *he brings himself near*, i. e. *draws near*, Exod. xxii. 7, Josh. vii. 14;—and, in a few instances, an active one; as, נִלְחַם *he fought*; נִשְׁעַן *he leaned upon*; נִשְׁבַּע *he swore*; נִשְׁפַּט *he contended, disputed*; יֵאָכֵל *it is*, or *may be, eaten*, Gen. vi. 21. So, לֹא־יֵעָשֶׂה כֵּן *it is not, may not, cannot*, or *ought not, to be done thus*; נִכְבַּד *he shewed himself honourable*; נֶאְדַּר *he shewed himself glorious*; נֶאֱנַח *he sighed*.

21st, These properties seem to be intimated in Arabic by the terms اللزوم والعلاج, *necessity and remedy*, which, Mr. Lumsden says, indicate "that verbs of this class must be INTENSITIVE by their own nature, and significant of actions performed by the members of the body:" but, the examples he adduces are not confined to this rule: كسر *he broke*, is as much an active verb as any other can be; which, when thus augmented becomes passive, not neuter: nor has حمق and انحمق *the market was unfrequented*, any thing to do with the members of the body. I am induced to believe, therefore, that the terms اللزوم والعلاج, are to be understood as intimating the properties above-mentioned.

---

* Arab. Gram. p. 187.

166. EXAMPLES OF THE FORMS ABOVEMENTIONED.

First Class of Hēemanti Nouns, having an א *prefixed.*

I. אֶפְקָד and אֶפְקַד, fem. אֶפְקָדָה, אֶזְרָח *home-born, indigenous,* אֶהְיֶה (changing (ה) to (י) on account of the following ה, Art. 151. 5, note), ὁ ὤν, a name of God, Exod. iii. 14, אֶצְעָדָה *a bracelet,* אֵיתָן (for אֶיְתָן Art. 93. 5.) *strength,* אֶתְנָן *reward, wages,* אֶצְבַּע *a finger.*

II. אֶפְקֹד, אֶגְרֹף *the fist,* אֶפְרֹחַ *the young of any bird,* אֶתְמוֹל *sometime ago, yesterday,* אֶשְׁכּוֹל *grapes.*

III. אַפְקָד, fem. אַפְקָדָה; as, אַחְלָם *an amethyst,* אַכְזָר *very cruel,* אַכְזָב *very false,* אַזְכָּרָה *recollection,* אָסָם (for אַסְוָם Art. 79.) *a granary,* אַקּוֹ (for אַנְקּוֹ or אַנְקָּו Art. 82. and 93.) *an animal so called.*

IV. אַפְקֵד; as, אַבְנֵט *a girdle,* אַרְבֶּה *the locust.*

V. אַפְקֹד, fem. אַפְקֹדֶת; as, אַשְׁפּוֹת *a dunghill,* אַשְׁמֹרֶת *guard, custody.*

VI. אַפְקִיד, fem. אַפְקִידָה; as, אָסִיף (for אַסְכִּיף Art. 83.) *a cruet,* אַשְׁמוּרָה *guard, custody.*

VII. אָפְקָד; as, אוּבָל or אֵבָל (for אָוְבָל) *a* (never-failing) *river.*

VIII. Some nouns which lose one of their radical letters by contraction assume the form of the Segolates; as, אֵבֶךְ (for אכפך) *the palm of the hand.*

2d, The nouns of this class are few; and of the last form, perhaps, a second does not occur. It is curious enough to remark, how easily nouns, deprived of any of their vowels, slide into the Segolate forms. We shall see hereafter, that the same thing often takes place in the conjugations of the verbs, in similar cases.—It will be seen that I have not entirely followed the classification of Simonis. My reason for doing so was this: he seems to me to have given some forms without examples to bear him out: and in one case he has given a form אַפְקִיד for which he has only one example, and that example he has also placed under another class. (See אַבְטִיחִים, pp. 547 and 639. Arcan. Form.)

167. *Second Class of Hēemanti Nouns having* י *prefixed.*

I. Form יִפְקֹד; as, יִצְחָר *oil,* יִצְחָק *Isaac.*

II. יַפְקֹד; as, יַעֲנָה *the ostrich.*

III. יַפְקִיד or יַפְקֵד, fem. יַפְקִידָה; as, יָחִיל (for יַחְיִיל) *one who expects,* יָפִיחַ *an herald* (for יַפְיִיחַ), יָרֵךְ (for יִרְכֵךְ) *the thigh,* יָרֵב (for יַרְיִיב) *a disputant,* יָנִיקָה (for יַנְיִיקָה) *a germ, stem,* &c.

IV. יַפְקוֹד;* as, יַחְלוֹם *an adamant,* יַנְשׁוֹף *an owl.*

V. יַפְקוּד; as, יַחְמוּר *a species of goat,* יַלְקוּט *a purse,* יָקוּם *being* (for יַקְוִים Art. 79.).

VI. יַפְקֵד; as, יוּבַל (for יַוְבֵל Art. 93. 2.) *a constant river.* And, according to some, the Segolate יֶרֶךְ *thigh* (for יִרְכֵךְ), the last radical being rejected, and the (ֶ) added, as in other Segolates, for the sake of Euphony.

2d, In this class also is placed, as a special anomaly, the word יְהוָה *Jehovah,*† with a caution, however, that these vowels do not exhibit the ancient pronunciation of the word. The Jews, as it is known to every one, never pronounce this word, but substitute either אֲדֹנָי or אֱלֹהִים for it; and hence it is, that we sometimes find it pointed יֱהוִה, i. e. with the vowels proper for the word אֱלֹהִים, which is invariably the case when אֲדֹנָי and יְהוָה occur together. The reason is, the word אֲדֹנָי would in this case be pronounced twice, which is not desirable; the word אֱלֹהִים is, therefore, pronounced instead of it (page 31, note). That *Jehovah* is not the ancient pronunciation most writers are agreed: but, what that was, it may be difficult to determine. Some have proposed יַהֲוֹה *Yāhăvó,* of the form יַפְקֹד, as Capellus, Walton, Clericus, &c. Others have proposed יְהֻוָה, יַהֲוָה, or יַהְוֶה, as Mercer, Montanus, Amama, Scaliger, &c. taking the Samaritan pronunciation of it, as preserved by Theodoret, Ἰαβέ.‡ Others again take the Latin *Jove;* but which of these is nearest to the original pronunciation, no one can say.

---

* Simonis places יָאֹר under this form: but as there is some difficulty in ascertaining the root from which it is derived, and as the word appears to be of Egyptian origin, it may as well be omitted.

† See Art. 147. 7, note.

‡ Simonis' Arcanum Formarum, p. 545.

168. *Third Class of Hēemanti Nouns beginning with* ה.

These forms, according to Simonis and Reimarus as quoted by him, were not much used before the time of the Captivity. He takes the liberty, however, of excluding all the Infinitives of the *Hiphḥíl* conjugation, which, I think, he ought not to do; because, I believe, these infinitives are nothing more than such nouns, upon which the conjugation is constructed; and, if this be the case, there will be no reason why they should not be considered as forming a part of this class.

Examples.

I. Form: הַפְקֵד or הַפְקֵיד; as, הַמְשֵׁל *rule, dominion,* הַשְׂכֵּל *intelligence,* הַשְׁמִיעַ *proclaiming, causing to hear,* הָסֵב (for הַסְבֵּב) *causing to return,* הֵפִיץ (for הַפְוִיץ) *dispersing,* הַנְשֵׁא (for הַנְשֵׂא) *seduction.* Roots ending in silent ה often reject it in words of this kind, and take וֹת as their terminating syllable: as, הַרְבֵּה and הַרְבּוֹת *multitude,* הַעֲלוֹת *elevation,* &c.*

II. הַפְקָדָה; as, הָנָחָה (for הַנְוָחָה) *tranquillity,* הַנָּפָה (for הַנְוָתָה) *agitation,* הַצָּלָה (for הַנְצָלָה) *liberation.*

III. הַפְקוּדָה; as, הֲפָגָה (for הַפְוּוגָה) *termination, cessation.*

IV. הַפְקָדוּת; as, הַשְׁמָעוֹת *relation,*† &c.

V. הַפְקוֹד; as, הַתּוֹךְ *pouring out* (pr. הִנָּתְוֹךְ Art. 82.).

---

* These, however, are probably compound nouns, formed of the original root with וֹת, a contracted form of הוֹת *being,* for הַוֹּת. See Artt. 78. 93.

† Words having this termination are also compounds formed of the *Hēemanti* noun, and the word הַוֹּת contracted to וֹת by Artt. 78. 93. 2, &c. The signification of which words, ending in וֹת and יוֹת, is, that of the *state* of action or passion denoted by the primitive word; a מַלְכוּת a *kingdom,* or state of reigning; רִאשׁוֹת *first state,* or *beginning* (Art. 93. 2. 4.).

VI. הִפְקֵד (for הִנְפְקֵד); as, הִלָּחֵם (for הִנְלָחֵם) *making war;* and so all the Infinitives of the *Niphál* species.

VII. הָפְקֵד or הֻפְקֵד; as, הָפְקֵד *visited, appointed,* הוּמַת *slain* (for הָוְמַת or הֻוְמַת Art. 93. 2.). These forms have a passive signification (Art. 165. 10.).

2d, It will immediately be seen, that the forms to which the particle ה is here prefixed, are by no means peculiar to the *Hiphḥíl* conjugation, and, consequently, that no one can, without violating the principles of analogy, derive them from that conjugation. The truth appears to me to be, that the *Hiphḥíl* conjugation is nothing more than the adjunction of one or other of the pronouns to words of the form פָּקִיד, &c. to which also the particle ה, or א for the Chaldee form, is prefixed, for the purpose of varying the sense, as already noticed.

169. *Fourth Class of Hēemanti Nouns commencing with* מ.

I. מִפְקֵד, fem. מִפְקָדָה, מִפְקֶדֶת, or מִפְקֵדֶת: masc. מִגְדָּל *a tower;* fem. מִלְחָמָה *war,* מַעֲשָׂקָה *oppression,* מִשְׁמֶרֶת *custody.*

II. מִפְקַד; for which Simonis gives only one example, and that has suffered contraction: as, מֶכֶב for מִיכָב.

III. מִפְקֶד; as, מִסְכֵּן *poor;* with final ה, מִזְרֶה *a fan,* &c.

IV. מִפְקוֹד, fem. מִפְקוֹדָה or מִפְקוֹדֶת; as, מִזְמוֹר *a psalm,* מִשְׁקֹלֶת *a plummet.*

V. מַפְקֵד; as, מַלְמָד *a goad,* מוֹתָר for מַוְתָר, *gain* (Art. 93.), מַפָּל for מַנְפָּל *soft,* &c. (Art. 82.).

VI. מַפְקֵד; as, מַחֲנַק (Art. 113. 2.) *strangling.*

VII. מַפְקֵד or מַפְקִיד, fem. מַפְקֵדָה; as, מַטְבֵּחַ *a slaughter-house,* מוֹפֵת for מַוְפֵת (Art. 93.) *a wonder,* מַרְאֶה *a vision,* מַזְרֵעַ *producing seed,* מַבְדִּיל *dividing,* מַדְמֵנָה *sterquilinium,* מְחִתָּה (for מַחְתֵּתָה) *consternation,* מְכִתָּה (for מַכְתֵּתָה) *contusion.*

VIII. מַפְקוֹד, fem. מַפְקוֹדָה or מַפְקוֹדֶת; as, מַחְסוֹר *want,* מַטְמוֹן *hidden* (treasure), מַרְכֹּלֶת *trading,* מַאֲכֹלֶת *food,* and מְנוֹרָה for מַנְוֹרָה (Art. 79.) *a candlestick.*

IX. מַפְקוּד, fem. מַפְקוּדָה; as, מַאֲבוּס *a stall*, מַבּוּל for מַנְבּוּל (Art. 82.) *a deluge*, fem. מְבוּסָה *trampling*, (for מַבְוּסָה Art. 79.).

X. מִפְקָד; as, מִבְטָ for מִנְבָּט (Art. 82.) *expectation*, מַחֲזֶה *vision* (Art. 113. 2.).

XI. מָפְקָד or מָפְקַד; as, מָעֳמָד *station*, with all the participles usually ascribed to the *Hophḥál* conjugation.

XII. מְפַקֵּד, מְפַקִּיד, and מְפַקּוּד; as, מְפַקֵּד *one who takes account*, with all the participial nouns usually attached to the *Píḥél* species. The remaining two are only variations of the same form, and occur but rarely.

XIII. מְפֻקָּד; as, מְלֻמָּד *learned*, מְנֻלָּה *discovered*. To which may be added all the participles usually ascribed to the species of *Pūḥál*.

XIV. מִתְפַּקֵּד; as, מִתְהַלֵּךְ *an invader*, &c. with all the participles of the *Hithpāḥél* species.

XV. Some defective nouns, which, for ease of pronunciation, assume a Segolate form, are derived from roots having a medial ו or י, or doubling the second radical, or having ה for the third. The forms will vary with those of the Segolates, and for the same reasons. If, therefore, we reject the last radical, &c. and prefix מ, we shall have מפק, for מפקד, pointed מֶפֶק, מֶפַק, מֶפָק, מִפֶּק, מִפַּק, מָפָק, מָפֶק, &c. as the nature of the word shall require; or rather, as the *jus et norma loquendi* has established: as, מֶכֶס *number, sum*; fem. מִכְסָה (root כסס); מֶעַל or מָעַל *elevation* (root עלה); מֶמַד, pl. מְמַדִּים *measures* (root מדד); מְצַד or מָצַד *a lurking place*, (root צוד or ציד); מְתֹם or מָתֹם *soundness* (root תמם), &c.

2d, Simonis thinks (p. 450, Arcan. Form.), that the participles should not be considered as nouns of the חֲאֲמַנְתִּי class. I believe they ought to be so considered; because I hold, that, properly speaking, there are no *participles* in the Hebrew Language. It is

true, the Grammarians have placed a number of these nouns in the same page with the paradigma of the verbs; but, it will not hence follow, that they are Participles. If, indeed, it could be shewn, that they involve the tenses of the verb as the Greek participles do, the opinion of Simonis, &c. would have some weight; but this has not been done; and, as I think, cannot be done satisfactorily. I have therefore thought it most conducive to the progress of the Student, as well as more conformable to the analogy of the Language, to class them all as nouns: it being from the context alone that any thing like tense is to be discovered.

170. *Fifth Class of Hēemanti Nouns beginning with* נ *or* הנ.

I. נִפְקָד, נִפְקָד, נַפְקָד, נַפְקוֹד, or הִנְפְּקָד; as, נָצָב (for נִנְצָב, perhaps for אַנְנְצָב or הַנְנְצָב) *fixed, set up;* נוֹשָׁב for נִוְשָׁב (Art. 93.) *inhabited;* נָסַב (for נִסְבַּב) *turned back,* &c. So all the participles and preterites of the *Niphhál* conjugation, with this difference, that the participle ends in (ִ), the preterite in (-); also, נַהֲפוֹךְ *turned about;* נַחְתּוֹם *sealed;* הִלָּחֵם *making war* (for הִנְלָחֵם, Art. 82.); הֵאָכֵל *eatable* (for הִנָּאֵכֵל, Artt. 82. 115.).

II. נַפְקָד; as, נָסַב (for נִסְבַּב), as נָסַב above. This is mostly found in words doubling their last radical letter; a form not found used in the *Niphhál* conjugation.

171. *Sixth Class of Hēemanti Nouns having* ת *prefixed.*

The forms commencing with ת, as given by Simonis, are the following:

I. תִּפְקָד, fem. תִּפְקָדָה; as, תִּקְוָה *hope;* תִּגָּרָה *conflict;* תִּימָרָה (for תִּיְמָרָה, Art. 93. 5.) *self-exaltation.*

II. תִּפְקוֹד, fem. תִּפְקוֹדָה and תִּפְקֹדֶת; as, תִּירוֹשׁ (for תִּירֹשׁ) *new wine;* תִּפוֹצָה (for תִּפְוֹצָה) *dispersion;* תִּלְבֹּשֶׁת *clothing.*

III. תַּפְקֵד, fem. תַּפְקֵדָה, or תַּפְקֶדֶת; as, תּוֹלֶד (for תַּוְלֵד) and תּוֹלֶדָה *generation, succession;* תּוֹחֶלֶת *hope, expectation;* תַּחְמָס *an ostrich.*

IV. תַּפְקֵד, fem. תַּפְקֵדָה, or תַּפְקֶדֶת; as, תַּרְעֵלָה *trembling, giddiness;* תּוֹכֵחָה (for תַּוְכֵחָה), and, on account of the guttural, תּוֹכַחַת (for תַּוְכֵחַת) *reprehension;* תְּפִלָּה (for תַּפְלֵלָה) *intercession;* תַּבְלִית (for תַּבְלֵלֶת) *self consumption;* תַּבְנִית (for תַּבְנֵיֶת, Art. 93. 4.) *form, pattern;* תַּרְמוּת (for תַּרְמֵיֶת, Ib.) *deception;* and תַּזְנוּת (for תַּזְנֵיֶת*) *whoredom.*

V. תַּפְקִיד, fem. תַּפְקִידָה; as, תַּלְמִיד *a disciple;* תַּכְרִיךְ *a robe;* תַּאֲנִיָּה *self torment* (for תַּאֲנִיָּהּ, *Yód* in many instances standing for ה, and, being doubled in this place, makes compensation for the ה which is rejected).

VI. תַּפְקוּד, fem. תַּפְקוּדָה and תַּפְקֻדֶת; as, תַּמְרוּק *self-purgation;* תַּמְרוּר *self-embittering;* תַּהֲלֻכָה (for תַּהֲלוּכָה) *continual walking;* תַּהְפֻּכָה *self-perversion;* תַּנְחֻמֶת *a proper name,* Jer. xl. 8, &c. So תְּשׁוּבָה (for תַּשְׁוּבָה, Art. 79.) *conversion;* תְּשׁוּמָה (for תַּשְׁוּמָה) and תְּשׁוּמֶת *reciprocal striking of hands in making a bargain,* &c.

VII. תַּפְקַד, fem. תַּפְקָדָה; as, תַּחְרָא or תַּחֲרָא *a breast plate,* תְּלָאָה (for תִּלְאָהָה) *weariness,* תְּעָלָה (for תִּעְלָהָה) *self-exaltation.*

VIII. תָּפְקֵד, fem. תָּפְקֵדָה; as, תָּרְמָה (for תָּרְמֵהָה) *deceit,* תּוּגָה (for תָּוְגָהָה Art. 92. 2.) *grief,* תְּאֵנָה (for תָּאֲנָהָה, contr. for תָּאְנָהָה or תָּאֳנָהָה) *occasion, opportunity.*

---

* See p. 129. note.

IX. תֻּפְקִיד, fem. תֻּפְקִידָה, תּוּכִן (for תָּוְכִן, from the root יכן or וכן) *division, separation,* תּוּשִׁיָּה (for תָּוְשִׁיָּה) *solidity, substance, wealth.*

X. Here, as in the former class, the rejection of the last or second radical will reduce the nouns to one or other of the segolate forms: as תֶּבֶל *confusion,* (for תַּבְלֵל perhaps): the latter ל being rejected, in order to avoid the repetition of similar sounds, we have תַּבְל, which, for reasons already assigned, (Art. 156. 2.) will become תֶּבֶל. In the same manner we have תֶּמֶס (for תמסס) *melting, dissolution,* &c. to which many others may be added.

XI. תְּבַקּוּד; as תְּבַלּוּל *suffusion* (of the eye). To which may be added a few others, reduplicating some of the radical letters; as, תְּקוֹמֵם *self-elevation,* &c.

It must have appeared, I think, that the forms to which this letter ת is prefixed, are by no means peculiar to the *Hithpāḥél* conjugation, but, that they exhibit a great variety of other forms. I cannot help thinking, therefore, that this conjugation owes something to this letter, or to its more perfect form הת or את, while the particle owes nothing whatever to the conjugation.

172. *Seventh Class of Hēemanti Nouns, receiving* הת *as a prefix.*

I. הִתְפַּקֵּד; as, הִתְיַחֵשׂ (Art. 115.) *genealogical computation.* So all the infinitives of the *Hithpāḥél* conjugation, due regard being paid to the radical letters composing such words. הִשְׁתַּחֲוָיָתִי *prostrating* (2 Kings v. 18), with a paragogic י, seems to be an anomalous word, deformed perhaps by the carelessness of the copyists.

II. הָתְפַּקֵּד *caused to be visited;* but perhaps this form never occurs used as a noun.

III. הִתְפַּקְּדוּת; as, הִתְחַבְּרוּת *confederation*, &c.*

In a few instances we have had, in the above examples, terminations in ח, ת, and וּת, which may be said to be *Hēemantic*. In these cases, therefore, we have anticipated our next chapter, which is to treat on the *Hēemantic* postfixed syllables: but, as we could not adduce our examples without bringing in these forms, we shall perhaps be excused.

* But this is perhaps a compound form as before, p. 129. note.

LECTURE VIII.

ON THE HEEMANTI LETTERS WHICH ARE POSTFIXED TO WORDS.

173. It has been stated, (Art. 164. 2.) that, the *Hēemanti* letters ה, י, ם, ן, and ת, are severally found attached to the ends of either primitive or derived words. The cases in which ה, ת, ות, ית. are found, have already been noticed (Artt. 142. 5, 143. 2, 169.). It will be unnecessary, therefore, to notice them further. We shall now proceed to consider those which end in י, ם, and ן, respectively.

Eighth Class of Hēemanti Nouns ending in ־י.

174. These nouns ending in ־י are used to express either persons or things, which have some relation to the signification of the primitive, from which they are derived; and, hence, they have been termed *Relative Nouns* by the Arabian Grammarians.* Of this kind are the Patronymic or Gentile nouns of the Grammars of Europe, all of which, must, from their nature, necessarily be attributive, and, therefore, subject to the variation necessary to distinguish the genders (Art. 142.).

2d, In endeavouring to account for the form and signification of this class of words, I must be allowed to suppose, as before, that the additional letter (י) is the fragment of some word, originally having the signification, which (י) now gives to words thus augmented. In the Ethiopic we have the triliteral adjunct אוי, used for the purpose

---

* الاسم المنسوب

of forming nouns of this class:* and, occasionally, in the Arabic وِيّ, وِي, which is also further abbreviated into ـِيّ, ي,† which is the augment universally found to prevail in the Hebrew.

3d, That the meaning attached to the root اوِيّ in Arabic, is suitable to the signification of these words, the following definition of it, given by Golius, will perhaps be sufficient to shew:—"*Se recepit commorandi vel quiescendi ergo, diversatus fuit interdiu vel noctu.* Applying this, then, to any proper name, we shall have both the form and sense proper for these Patronymics: e. g. Ethiopic form ישראלאוי *Israelavi:* Hebrew and Arabic by contraction, יִשְׂרְאֵלִי, إِسْرَائِيلِيّ *a person related to the patriarch Israel,* by connexion, residence, birth, &c. So יְהוּדִי (for יְהוּדָדִי, Art. 81.) *a descendant of Judah;* and so of others.

4th, It may also be considered as a proof of the truth of this conjecture, that these Hebrew nouns, when receiving any asyllabic augment, are generally found with the ـִי doubled by *Dāgésh:* as, לְוִיִּם *Levites;* תַּחְתִּיִּה *below,* &c. which seem to be their true forms. See Art. 143. 5.‡

5th, The following are a few examples, with their primitives: כְּנַעֲנִי *a Canaanite,* from כְּנַעַן *Canaan;* נְגִידִי *princely,* from נָגִיד *a prince;* רָעִי *pastoral* (for רֹעֵהִי by contraction), from רֹעֶה *a shepherd;* צָפוֹנִי *belonging to the north,* from צָפוֹן *the north.*

6th, When, however, the primitive word ends in ـִי, the Patronymic is formed by prefixing the article only:§ as, מוּשִׁי *Mūshi,* a son of Merari; הַמּוּשִׁי *one of his descendants:* שׁוּנִי the name of one of the sons of Gad; הַשּׁוּנִי one of his descendants. So גּוֹנִי *patron;* הַגּוֹנִי, Gen. xlvi. 24. In one instance ת is prefixed instead of ת,

---

* See Ludolf's Ethiop. Gram. fol. edit. pp. 95, 97.

† See Mr. de Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 239, &c.

‡ The *teshdeed* which is always found to accompany this ـِيّ in Arabic, may perhaps have been added originally for the purpose of supplying the defect occasioned by the rejection of one or two letters from the primitive word.

§ Of this property of the definite article some account will be given hereafter.

which may have been done for the purpose of avoiding the concurrence of two aspirates: as, תַּחְכְּמֹנִי *Takhkĕmōní*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, from חַכְמֹנִי 1 Chron. xi. 11. We have, however, מָדִי *a Mede*, Dan. xi. 1, from מָדַי *Media*.

7th, In forming Patronymics from compounds, two methods have been adopted: one by adding י as before, which is regular; the other, by also prefixing the article to the last word in the compound. Examples: 1. בֶּן יְמִינִי *a Benjamite*; 2. בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי *the Bethlehemite*, 1 Sam. xvii. 58; בֵּית הַשִּׁמְשִׁי *the native of Beth Shemesh*, from בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ; בֵּית הָאֵלִי *the native of Bethel*; בֶּן הַיְמִינִי *the Benjamite*, 1 Kings ii. 8.

8th, Nouns ending in ו do not form the Patronymic by the addition of יִ־, but by some periphrasis: as, בַּעֲלֵי־יְרִיחוֹ *the citizens of Jericho*, Josh. xxiv. 11. So אַנְשֵׁי יְרֵחוֹ *men of Jericho*, Neh. iii. 2; בְּנֵי יְרֵחוֹ *children of Jericho*, Ib. vii. 36; בְּנוֹת שִׁילֹה *daughters of Shiloh*, Judg. xxi. 21. In a few instances נִי is added: as, הַגִּילֹנִי *Haggīlōní*, from גִּלֹה *Gīló*, 2 Sam. xv. 12, Josh. xv. 51.*

9th, The same frequently takes place in compound words: as, בְּנֵי עַזְמָוֶת *the children of Kiryath Ḥarim*, Ezra ii. 25; בְּנֵי עַזְמָוֶת *the children of Ḥazmáveth*, Ib. ver. 24.

10th, Proper names ending in ם are sometimes subject to the same rule: as, אַנְשֵׁי סְדֹם *men of Sodom*.

11th, In Patronymics derived from compounds, the last only of the compound is sometimes taken: as, אֶרֶץ יְמִינִי, for אֶרֶץ בֶּן יְמִינִי *the land of the Benjamite*, 1 Sam. ix. 4.†

12th, Some primitives ending in ן drop that letter in forming the patronymic: as, הַנַּעֲמִי *Hannāḥamí*, Num. xxvi. 40, from נַעֲמָן *Nāḥămán*.

13th, In forming Patronymics from dual or plural words, one or other of the following methods is adopted: 1, The word, from which such patronymic is to be formed, is reduced to its primitive form, and then יִ־ is to be

---

* So in Arabic رُوحَانِي in *spiritual*, جِسمَانِي *belonging to the body*, &c.

† These abbreviations are found to take place in most languages. See M. de Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 247. Lud. Gram. Eth. fol. edit. p. 22. Wilkins's Sanscrit Gram. Art. 1174. &c.

added as before: as, מִצְרַיִם *Egypt,* primitive מִצְרָ, and with ־י, מִצְרִי *an Egyptian.* 2, Either יוֹשֵׁב *inhabitant,* בַּת *daughter,* or מִן *out of,* may precede such proper name: as, יוֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַיִם *inhabitant of Jerusalem;* Isa. v. 3, בַּת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם *daughter of Jerusalem;* or וְכָלְיָה מִן־יְרוּשָׁלַיִם *Jecoliah of Jerusalem,* 2 Chron. xxvi. 3.

14th, In a few places the primitive is put for the patronymic, which may be considered, either as presenting a metonymy, by which the progenitor, &c. is put for the descendant, or by supposing an ellipsis to be made of one of the words יוֹשֵׁב, בַּת, מִן, &c. as stated above: as, דַּמֶּשֶׂק *Damascus,* for *Damascene,* Gen. xv. 2; בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי for בֵּית לָחֶם 2 Sam. xxiii. 15. So יַעֲקֹב for בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, יִשְׂרָאֵל for בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *passim.*

15th, Irregularities are occasionally met with in the forms of these words: as, הַגְרִי *a Hagarene,* 1 Chron. v. 10, from הָגָר *Hagar,* as if the primitive had been a Segolate of the form הַגֶר; תִּמְנִי *Timnite,* Judg. xv. 6, for תִּמְנָתִי, primitive תִּמְנָת. So, הַשַּׁלְנִי Numb. xxvi. 20, primitive שֵׁלָה: and הַשִּׁילֹנִי, which occurs, 1 Chron. ix. 5; הָעַמּוֹנִי *the Ammonite,* the primitive being בֶּן־עַמִּי. See 1 Sam. xi. 1, and Gen. xix. 38, from which, however, the collective form עַמּוֹן *Ammon* has been formed, Ib. and thence the Patronymic.

16th, For the feminine forms of these nouns, see Art. 143. 5, and for the plurals, Art. 147. The forms taken in construction, or when any of the pronouns are attached, will be regulated according to the analogy of the word, &c. as already intimated.

17th, There is another class of nouns ending in י, preceded by (-) or (ֵ) which have been thought to denote excess. These, however, are probably nothing more than nouns in the plural number (Art. 147. 6.). The following are examples: גּוֹבַי *a swarm of locusts;* חַלּוֹנַי *many windows;* כִּילַי *extremely greedy;* שָׂדַי *a plain;* שַׁדַּי *the Almighty,* root שדד *powerful;* אֲדוֹנַי *supreme Lord,* from אָדוֹן.

We now proceed to the IXth class of augmented

nouns, which take the *Hēemanti* letter ם at the end.

175. In this class, the vowel immediately preceding the final ם is either (ִ) or (ֹ), which induced Hiller to suppose, that the adjunct was הָם, or אוֹם, respectively. It is believed that these nouns are *intensitive* in signification. If then we suppose הָם to be a particle derived from הָמָה, which means *tumult,* as of *a multitude,* or *noise,* as of the waves of the sea, we can easily conceive how the addition of such a particle to any primitive word would make it intensitive as to meaning.* This will account, perhaps, for the termination ם־. In the next place, the root אוֹם does not occur in the Hebrew Bible, but is to be found in the Arabic أَوَمَ, signifying, *he became fat,* or *corpulent.* If, then, we can suppose an abbreviated form of this word to be attached to any other, we shall have the termination וֹם, which will also give an *intensitive* signification to the compound. The following are a few examples: the student may arrange them under their respective measures, if he shall think it necessary to do so.

כִּנִּם *lice;* יוֹמָם *the whole day;* אָמְנָם *most truly;* דּוּמָם *quite silent;* עִירֹם, or עֵרֹם *quite naked;* פְּדְיוֹם and פִּדְיוֹן *full redemption;* כֻּלָּם *the entire whole;* מְתֹם *a body of men,* Judg. xx. 48.

---

* Nothing, surely, can be be more ridiculous than the opinion of Simonis and others, expressed in his "Arcanum Formarum," (p. 584. 5.), viz.: that the figures of ם and ן being extended, may account for the *intensitive* meaning, which their addition to a primitive word gives to its sense; and, that ם being inclosed, also gives the idea of *comprehensiveness,* like a pregnant mother, inclosing her offspring within the womb! For, it is very possible that these words may have been in use before the letters were invented.

Tenth Class of Hēemanti Nouns, receiving a final ן.

176. The Grammarians are generally agreed, that nouns, receiving this letter as a final, are *intensitive* in signification.

What this letter may have originally been derived from, it may be difficult now to say, as it is, what may have been the primitive, from which we have such termination, as that in the English words *Formation, Station*, or the like. That these words are given in Latin, under the forms *Formatio, Statio*, &c. there can be no doubt, and, that the *n*, added in the English is derived from the Latin declension ending in *o-nis, ne*, &c. is equally certain; but, whence this termination has been derived is not yet known: nor is it our intention here to offer any conjecture on the subject. We may, perhaps, be excused, however, if we offer something with reference to the Hebrew form, which, should it fail of producing conviction on the mind of the Reader, may, nevertheless, have the beneficial result of enabling him to remember both the forms and powers of the nouns of this class.

2d, This letter then is affixed to words, simple or augmented, with the vowels (ֵ) or (ִ); thus ־ֶן or ־וֹן—; whence we may suppose, that אוֹן, or חוֹן, signifying *strength, power, riches, wealth* (the primitive form of which will be אַוָן, or הַוִי, Art. 93.) is the root. And hence, also, we may have the form אָנָן, or הָנָן, contracted by Art. 81. to אָן or הָן, which may present the words, from which these terminations have been taken; and which, added to any word, would naturally give it an *intensitive* meaning. Some have also supposed the meaning to be occasionally diminutive.* But this seems now to be generally given up.

Examples.

אַלְמָן, fem. אַלְמָנָה *a widow*; אִתָּן *a large gift*; דָּגָן (for דַּגְהָן Art. 79.) root דָּגָה *corn*; also with the additional ־ִית, בִּירָנִית *a great palace*.

אַלְמֹון *widowhood*; אִיתוֹן (for אִתְיוֹן Artt. 78. 79.) *frequent entry*; אַרְמוֹן, or הַרְמוֹן *a palace*; עֶלְיוֹן *The Most High*. So also with augmented nouns: as, בִּטָּחוֹן *great confidence*; בִּזָּיוֹן *great contempt*; צִמָּאוֹן *great drought*,

* See the "Arcanum Formarum," p. 564.

&c. And, in some instances, as in קָטָן, pl. קְטַנִּים *little, least,* &c., this ן seems to have been added, but dropped and restored by Art. 83.

3d, A few proper names receive וְ: as, יְדִיתוּן 1 Chron. xvi. 38; זְבֻלוּן Gen. xxx. 20; יְשֻׁרוּן *Jeshurun,* &c.

4th, This intensitive letter נ is frequently attached to verbs, where it is usually termed *Nún Paragogic,* or *Epenthetic.* It is found in Arabic in the same situation, and is termed by the Arabian Grammarians, النّون التّاكيدي *The confirmatory Nún,* the office of which is to impart *certainty* or *intensity* to the verb, to which it is attached. The same powers have been ascribed to the Hebrew נ similarly situated,* though, it must be confessed, such powers are not always apparent from the context.

N.B. All words thus augmented, whether the augment is prefixed or postfixed, may be considered as compound words.

On the Reduplicated and otherwise Compounded Words.

177. There will be no difficulty in perceiving, that, if one word may be qualified or otherwise restricted in its signification by the addition of another, a similar consequence will also take place, when the same word is repeated: and, that the effect will be the same, whether both such words are written out at length, or, whether they are combined in one. Accordingly we

---

* Nun *Paragogicum,* Verborum personis in Jod et Vau finitis additum semper esse *Emphaticum,* notat Hottingerus de *Officiis Literarum Servil.* Analysi Jobi subjectis, §. 9. Arcan. Form. p. 564. And Schrœder gives the following passage as illustrative of this opinion: 1 Sam. xvii. 25, אֲשֶׁר יַכֶּנּוּ יַעְשְׁרֶנּוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ *qui percusserit illum, hunc ditabit rex:* ubi," says he, " sonus fortior est, quam si scriptum esset יַכֶּהוּ et יַעְשְׁרֶהוּ &c." R. 168.

find both these methods adopted in the Hebrew: for, in some cases entire words are found in this reduplicated state, in others they are contracted into one word, by rules presently to be considered. In the first case; עָמוֹק עָמוֹק *deep deep*, i. e. *most deep*, Eccl. vii. 24; סוֹבֵב סוֹבֵב *turning turning*, i. e. *continually turning*, or *changing*, Ib. i. 6: לֵב וָלֵב *heart and heart*, i. e. *double heart*, Ps. xii. 3; בְּאֵרוֹת בְּאֵרוֹת *wells wells*, i. e. *many wells*, Gen. xiv. 10; מַטֵּה מַטֵּה *rod rod*, i. e. *rod by rod*, Num. xvii. 17. In what sense such reduplicated expressions are to be taken, the context will always be sufficient to determine. The same may be said with respect to compound words. In some instances it will be augmented, as in superlatives; in others modified; and in some, perhaps, diminished, as in the diminutive nouns of other languages.

2d, Let us come, in the second place, to the rules which have been given for the formation of reduplicated words.* It has been shewn (Art. 78.) that any one of the אהוי letters, will, in certain instances, disappear. This is the case in the first class of these reduplicated words, where we have סַאסָאָה for סְאָה סְאָה, which when compounded would become סְאַהְסָאָה, and striking out ה by Art. 79, we have סְאַסָאָה, which, again, by drawing back the (-) and rejecting the (ּ) by Art. *id.*, we have סַאסָאָה, and, if we place (·) *Dāgésh* in the second *Sāméḵ*, either for the sake of euphony, or to compensate for the loss of ה, we shall have סַאסָּאָה for the reduplicated word, meaning, *measure by measure*,

---

* We use the word *reduplicated* to signify words which have been formed by the reduplication of some one primitive word;—*compound*, to signify those which have been formed by coalescence of two different words. In this sense Simonis uses the words *Geminata* and *Composita*.

as both the composition of the word and the context require. In some cases, as it will presently be seen, the final ה of such words is also rejected. It must also be borne in mind by the student, that considerable difference of opinion is found to prevail among the grammarians, as to the original roots from which these words have been derived; and consequently, that great difference of opinion is found to prevail as to their signification.

3d, The following are a few examples of the first class of this kind of nouns, which are generally thought to be formed by a reduplication of some word having ה for its final radical letter: e. g. עַרְעָר *quite naked,* or *deserted,* from the root עָרָה *naked:* by some also supposed to mean the juniper, by others the tamarisk, tree; קַשְׂקֶשֶׂת *the scales of a fish,* from קָשָׂה *peeling;* שַׁעֲשֻׁעִים *exquisite delights,* from שָׁעָה *looking on* (with delight); תַּלְתַּל *copiously flowing* (hair), from תָּלָה *hanging;* תַּעְתֻּעִים *many and great errors,* from תָּעָה *erring.*

4th, The second class of reduplicated nouns consists of combinations derived from primitive nouns which have their second and third radical letters the same: as, בַּרְבֻּרִים *most choice* (beasts or birds), from בָּרַר *selecting;* גַּלְגַּל *a wheel, sphere,* or any thing subject to continual turning about, as *chaff,* &c. from גָּלַל *rolling.* And hence גֻּלְגֹּלֶת *the skull;* גַּרְגַּר *gargarism, gargle:* also *a grain* or *berry,* from גָּרַר *drawing,* &c. to which many more may be added. It has been shewn (Art. 83.) that when the last two letters of any primitive word are the same, one of them may be dropped for the sake of euphony. This rule holds good when such words are combined, and for the same reason.

5th, To this class may also be added reduplicated words, which, in their primitive forms, usually reject a medial ו or י: for here, as in the foregoing examples,

we may consider the middle radical letter as being rejected for the sake of euphony (Art. 81.). Of this sort are the following examples: חַלְחָלָה *great pain*, from חָוַל, or חִיל *grieving*; טַלְטֵלָה *grievous ejection*, or *captivity*, from טוּל *casting out*; עַפְעַפִּים *eyelids*, from עוּף *moving quickly, flying*; צַפְצָפָה *flowing copiously*, from צוּף *flowing*, Ezek. xvii. 5.

6th, The third class of reduplicated nouns includes those which are formed by a repetition of the last syllable, or, of the two last letters of the primitive noun: as, הַבְהָבִים *great gifts*, from יָהַב *giving*, the י being rejected; אֲדַמְדָּם, fem. אֲדַמְדֶּמֶת *reddish, red here and there, having red spots*, from אָדַם *being red*; אֲסַפְסֻף *mixed collection*, or *multitude*, from אָסַף *collecting*; הַפְכְפַךְ *most perverse*, from הָפַךְ *turning over*, &c. חֲלַקְלַקּוֹת *most smooth*, i. e. *deceiving words* or *things*, from חָלַק *polishing, smoothing*, &c.

7th, The fourth class of reduplicated nouns are those which are found to repeat the last radical letter of the primitives, inserting, at the same time, some vowel between the letters so doubled: as, אֲמֻלָּל, or אֻמְלָל *most languid*, from אָמַל *anxious*; גַּבְנֻנִּים *eminences, great heaps, hills*, from גִּבֵּן *gibbous*; נַאֲפוּף *great* or *frequent adultery*, from נָאַף *committing adultery*; נַהֲלוֹל *a well watered pasture*, from נָהַל *leading to the water*, &c., to which many more might be added.

8th, In forming the plurals of these and similar compounds, regard is to be had principally to the analogy of the last component part of the word. In no case can the addition of any increment, whether syllabic or asyllabic, affect a syllable beyond the penultimate of any word. In words, therefore, consisting of a large number of syllables, no change will take place in the vowels beyond the penultimate, and, in many instances, not beyond the ultimate. The only question, then, that can arise must be, as to the change of the ultimate

or penultimate vowels. In primitive words, indeed, a greater number of vowels does not exist: and, there, as we have seen, analogy alone can be relied upon. The same is true here. For, first: In all cases, except those in which the second and third radical is the same, upon any asyllabic augment being attached to a word, the preceding vowel must be either perfect or rejected; otherwise the syllable will be incomplete: as, הַבְהָבִים *great gifts*, כּוֹכְבֵי *stars of*——. Here, as the asyllabic ־ִים must necessarily take the last consonant of the word, in order to give it utterance, the preceding vowel must become perfect, or be rejected. But, if the root had its second and third radical letters the same, and one had been thrown away for the sake of euphony, then, upon any augment being introduced, this rejected letter would return, expressed by *Dāgésh forte*, placed in the terminating letter (Art. 83.): as, זַלְזְלִים *worthless supernumerary shoots*, from זַלְזָל, the root of which is זָלַל *vile*, Isa. xviii. 5.

9th, The only question which can now arise is, How will these vowels be affected, when the noun is in the state of construction? Generally speaking, unless there be some reason for retaining a perfect vowel, i. e. when some letter has been retrenched for which compensation ought to be made, and hence a perfect vowel retained, either *Sheva*, or one of its substitutes, will appear in the penultimate: as, כּוֹכְבֵי *the stars of* ——, &c. not כּוֹכָבֵי. But this can be determined only from a knowledge of the analogy of the word.

10th, We shall now give a few examples of each sort of compound words, omitting the classification of Simonis as unnecessary: עֲרָפֶל *thick darkness*, from עָרַב *it became dark*, and אָפַל (Arab. افل) *the sun set*; קִיקָלוֹן *filthy vomiting*, from קִיא *vomiting*, and קָלוֹן *base*; פַּרְשֶׁז *widely expanding*, from פָּרַשׂ *expand*, and פָּרַז *separating*; רַטָּפָשׁ *invigorating, refreshing*, from רָטָב *moisture*, and פָּשׁ *increasing, spreading*; אֲבַטִּיחַ *a melon*, from אבט Arab. *he cast down*, and בטח nearly the same; אֲנַרְטָל *a bason*, from אָנַר *collecting*, and טַל *blood*, Arabic, or as others, טַל *dew, water*; אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפְּנִים *chief satraps*, according to some, from the Persic; אחש اخش *price, pre-eminence*, and

שתרף سترپ *a satrap;* according to others, *the chief door keepers,* from אחש اخش, as before, and דרבן דַּרְבָּאן *door keeper;* גִּזְבָּר *treasurer,* from גַּז γάζα (Pers. كنز or كنج) and ור or בר (Pers. وار or بار) *agent,* גִּנְזָךְ *treasury* (perhaps the diminutive كنزك or كنجك of the above); מְאוּמָה *something, any thing,* from מָה אוֹ מָה *quid aut quid;* שַׁלְהֶבְתְּיָה *flame of the Lord,* according to some from שׁ, a Chaldaic particle, להב, or להבת *flame,* and יה *the Lord;* according to others, from שׁוּב *inflaming,* Syriac, and להבת *a flame,* and יה as before. Others again take the ש as derived from the Arabic שהאב شهاب *flame,* &c. as before. In the list of various readings given by Ben Naphthali, this word is read as two שַׁלְהֶבֶת יָהּ, which is probably the ancient way in which it was written. Some of these, as it will be seen, are foreign words: but, as the number of such is few in the Hebrew Bible, and as the Dictionary must be consulted for their signification and etymology, we have thought it unnecessary to investigate their forms and composition further.

On the Forms and Composition of Nouns adopted as Proper Names.

178. By *Proper Names,* we understand those words or phrases which have been adopted for the purpose of conveying the ideas of certain *specific persons* or *things.* By names of persons are to be understood, names of God, Deities, Angels, Men, &c.; of things, those of kingdoms, cities, towns, villages, mountains, rivers, &c., provided they be definite: as, first, יְהוָה *Jehovah;* בַּעַל זְבוּב *Bāal Zĕvúv;* גַּבְרִיאֵל *Gavriél;* יְהוֹשֻׁעַ

Jĕhōshúăḥ, &c. Second: אַשּׁוּר *Ashshúr*; מִצְרַיִם *Egypt*; יְרוּשָׁלַיִם *Jerusalem*, &c. And, in short, any word which is used to designate any specific object, (although the same may, in other instances, be used as an Appellative,) is termed a *Proper Name*, and is to be construed as such. *Lion*, for example, is an appellative; and yet it is as often used as a proper name, and so of others.

2d, Whence it will be seen, that occasions might occur, in which it will be extremely difficult to determine whether such word was originally intended to be taken as an appellative, or as a proper name.*

3d, In the first place, then, Proper Names which are purely Hebrew, (for some appear to be of foreign extraction,) are, for the most part, found to follow the analogy of the Appellatives; at others, to present forms unknown to them. Those which are of the same forms with the Appellatives, we need not now notice, as those forms have already been discussed.

4th, The simple forms of proper names which are here found to differ from those of the appellatives, are, 1st, those which take some form peculiar to the persons of the verbs; and, 2d, those which add וֹ to the end: as, 1st, יִשְׁבֶּק *Ishbák, he excelled;* יָשׁוּב *Yāshúv, he returns,* or *shall return;* יִצְחָר *Itskhár, he shines,* &c.; and, 2d, as, אוֹנוֹ *Ōnó;* יְרֵחוֹ *Yĕrēkhó, Jericho.* A few foreign names are found of the form פָּקְדַת; as, בָּשְׂמַת *Basmath.*

5th, Names compounded with one or other of the divine names occur very frequently; a circumstance which, according to Simonis, happens only twice, with respect

---

* Glass. Phil. Sac. pp. 696, 705, 780, &c.

to the Appellatives; i. e. in אֲרִיאֵל *Ărĭél*, and מָאֲפֵלְיָה *Māăphēlyá*. Another remarkable circumstance is, that in these compositions the order is sometimes inverted: as, יְהוֹשַׁבְעַת *Yĕhōshavḥáth*, for שַׁבַּעַת יְהוָה *Shavḥáth Yĕhōváh:* which Simonis terms *Anastrophe.** This never takes place in the Appellatives. With these exceptions only, the forms of proper names, whether simple or compound, constantly follow those of the Appellatives; the significations of both being ascertained precisely in the same way. It would be superfluous to swell this work with numerous examples; particularly as they may be found in the "Onomastica" of Hiller and Simonis, classed, arranged, and discussed, as far perhaps as the most sanguine enquirer can wish.

6th, Having stated what the general rules relating to the formation and composition of Proper Names are, we may now notice a few irregularities which are occasionally found to take place. These may be classed under the heads of, I. Omissions, II. Additions, III. Transpositions, of certain letters or syllables; and, IV. The changes of certain letters of the same organs.

7th, Omissions: and, in the first case, of the initial letter of the primitive word; e. g. רָם 1 Chron. ii. 9, for אֲרָם Matt. i. 3. Αραμ, in the name of a person, Job xxxii. 2; and, of a place, 2 Chron. xxii. 5, אֲרָם. In a compound פַּס דַּמִּים 1 Chron xi. 13, for אֶפֶס דַּמִּים 1 Sam. xvii. 1. In this last case, אֶפֶס is taken by some as an Appellative; הוּמָה is thought by some to be the same with אֱדוֹם *Édúm*, i. e. *Edom.* Others have taken this to be a mystical name, from the signification of the word דום *to come to silence.*

8th, In the following instances, a letter has been dropped from the middle of the word: as, אַבִיגַל 2 Sam. xvii. 25, for אֲבִיגָיִל 1 Chron. ii. 16. So אַרַנָה 2 Sam. xxiv. 16. and אָרְנָן 1 Chron. xxi. 25. So דַּמֶּשֶׂק, but 2 Chron. xxviii. 5, דַּרְמֶשֶׂק; יָוֹב Gen xlvi. 13., for which

* Onomast. Vet. Test. p. 435.

we have יָשׁוּב 1 Chron. vii. 1; שַׁמָּה 1 Sam. xvii. 13, is written שַׁמְעָה 1 Chron. iii. 5, and שַׁמּוּעַ 2 Sam. v. 14.

3. In the following words a letter has been omitted at the end; אָדָם Josh. iii. 16, which is אַדְמָה Chap. xix. 36; קִיר־חָרֶשׂ Is. xvi. 11, and Ib. v. 7, קִיר־חֲרֶשֶׂת; אֶפְרָת 1 Chron. ii. 19; אֶפְרָתָה Ib. v. 24.

9th, Under the head omissions may properly be noticed those defects which are found to take place in patronymics, &c. derived from compound proper names. Compounds, in any case, are troublesome words on account of their length; but in proper names this would be less tolerable than in any other. The consequence has been, most nations have used contractions, by omitting some part or other of the compound word (see Art. 174. 11. note). Hence יְמִינִי for בִּנְיָמִינִי 1 Sam. ix. 1, Jud. xix. 16, and Esth. ii. 5; אִישׁ יְמִינִי *a man, a Benjamite.* So 1 Chron. xx. 5, לַחְמִי, put as some believe for בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי *Bethlehemite*, conf. 2 Sam. xxi. 19; רָמַת לֶחִי Judg. xv. 17, Ib. ver. 9. 14. 19, is written simply לֶחִי.*

10th, To these may be added, יָעָר Ps. cxxxii. 6; for קִרְיַת יְעָרִים 1 Sam. vii. 1, &c., where the English version has "the fields of *the wood*;" יְרוּשָׁלַם passim, is written שָׁלֵם Ps. lxxvi. 3; *Bethlehem,* לָחֶם 1 Chron. iv. 22; *Bethaven,* Hos. x. 5, is אָוֶן ver. 8.

11th, Some additions which are peculiar to proper names have already been given (No. 8.). We now come to the transposition of letters or syllables: אֶלִיעָם 2 Sam. xi. 3, is עַמִּיאֵל 1 Chron. iii. 5,

---

* With respect to this last passage, Pilkington has remarked—"The word לחי, as an Appellative, signifies, *a jaw bone;* but, as it was also the proper name of the place, where the Philistines met Samson, and where he slew a thousand of them with the *jaw bone* of an ass, the name also of Ramath-Lehi was given to the place, where he cast away the *jaw bone*. To consider the word then, as Appellative, in the next verse; and to say that, 'When Samson was thirsty, God clave an hollow place that was in the *jaw*, and there came water thereout,' must be through want of common attention; because, they immediately subjoin, 'Wherefore he called the name thereof *En hakkore* (q. d. The well of him that called) which is in *Lehi*, unto this day.'—Such mistakes as these give wrong ideas to the ignorant; and furnish the scoffers with matter of ridicule."—"The error indeed, is corrected in the margin, which hath *Lehi*, &c."—Remarks upon several passages of Scripture, &c., by Matthew Pilkington, Cambridge, 1759, p. 157.

in which the component parts of the compound change places, by Anastrophe as above noticed (No. 5.); יְהוֹיָכִין 2 Kings xxiv. 6. 8, is יְכָנְיָה 1 Chron. iii. 16; and, by omission, with the addition of ו, כָּנְיָהוּ Jer. xxii. 24; תִּמְנַת־סֶרַח Josh. xxiv. 30, is תִּמְנַת־חֶרֶס Judg. ii. 9; חוּשָׁה 1 Chron. iv. 4, but Ib. 11, שׁוּחָה. So בֶּטַח 2 Sam. viii. 8, is written טִבְחַת 1 Chron. xviii. 8; to which some others might be added. According to Hiller,* examples of this kind are very numerous: but in these, as the significations adduced by him are grounded on conjectural etymologies, little reliance can be placed on them.

12th, We now proceed to give a few examples in which the letters of the same organ have taken place of one another (Art 84.); בְּרֹאדַךְ 2 Kings xx. 12, written מְרֹאדַךְ Is. xxxix. 1, and מְרֹדַךְ 2 Kings xxv. 27, Jer. l. 2. In the last instance, a quiescent א is also omitted (Art. 78.); עָכָן Josh. vii. 18, written עָכָר 1 Chron. ii. 7, and to this last an allusion is made in the text; בַּת־שֶׁבַע 2 Sam. xi. 3, and בַּת־שׁוּעַ 1 Chron. iii. 5; נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר Dan. i. 1; נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר Jer. xxi. 2; נֹף Is. xix. 13, and מֹף Hos. ix. 6, *Memphis*. Several changes of ד and ר may be observed in the words *Khemdán*, Gen. xxxvi. 26; *Khemrán*, 1 Chron. i. 41; *Dōdānim*, Gen. x. 4, is given *Rōdānim*, 1 Chron. i. 7; *Rīpháth*, Gen. x. 3, is *Dīpháth*, 1 Chron. i. 6; *Dĕḥūél*, Num. i. 14, is *Rĕḥūél*, Ib. ii. 14; *Hădad-Ḥézer*, 2 Sam. viii. 3, is *Hădar-Ḥézer*, 1 Chron. xviii. 5. These letters, although not of the same organ, are found in other languages frequently interchanged. Their change in Hebrew has often been accounted for, from the probability of the Scribes having mistaken the form of the one for that of the other, which is likely enough to have been the case. I think also, that confusion may have arisen from their similarity of sound; which we find has sometimes taken place in other languages.

13th, It may not be amiss to offer a few remarks here on those proper names, which are found to end in (י) *Yód*, not only because their number is very considerable; but also, because, they afford some curious information on the subject of ancient Hebrew theology.

14th, These, according to Hiller,† may be classed under four heads.

---

* Onomasticon, V. Test. p. 365.

† Ib. pp. 228, 229.

First, Those which may be termed *Denominatives*, on account of some particular circumstance being alluded to, when they were first given: as, לֵוִי *Lēvi*, meaning *Conjunctive*, see Gen. xxix. 34. To which may be added all Paronymics used as proper names.

15th, Secondly, Words found in a mutilated state, which were originally composed of one or other of the Divine names: as חֶלְקִי for חִלְקִיָּה or חִלְקִיָּהוּ, signifying, *the Lord* (is) *a portion*. So עַבְרִי for עִבְרִיָּה *stripped of God;* to which many others might be added. The intervening י *Yod*, however, is in many cases allowed by all to be nothing more than a sort of connecting letter, as in the case of עַבְדִיאֵל for עֶבֶד אֵל *servant of God*.

16th, This method of compounding the Divine name with other words for the purpose of forming proper names, is certainly of great antiquity among the Jews, and may safely be appealed to in proof of the position, that they never did, as a nation, acknowledge any other God, than that urged upon their notice by the last prophet. Whether we can extract from it the fact, that they also understood the doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, of the *Immutability*, *Invisibility*, *Incomprehensibility*, and of the other attributes of the Deity, as known and taught among ourselves now, does not seem to be quite so clear as Hiller will have it,* although we cannot hence infer their ignorance of these things. It is also worthy of notice, that the names given to individuals among the Babylonians and other nations contiguous to the Jews, were, for the most part, either the names of their idols, or compounds including one or other of their titles. The same practice is found to prevail among the pagans of the present day.

17th, Thirdly, *Yod* is said to be paragogic when found attached to substantives used as proper names: as, רוֹמַמְתִּי עֶזֶר 1 Chron. xxv. 4. 31; אֶדְרֶעִי Numb. xxi. 33: עֵין גֶּדִי Josh. xv. 62, &c.

18th, Fourthly, *Yod* is said to be the pronoun of the 1st person singular in the following and similar examples: מַלּוֹתִי 1 Chron. xxv. 4; גְּדַלְתִּי Ib. ver. 4. 29.

19th, Having said thus much on the analogy and irregularities found to prevail in the forms of proper names, and referred the Student to those writers who

---

* Onomast. Vet. Test. p. 261, &c.

have treated these subjects at great length, we shall now offer a few remarks: 1. On the persons by whom they have been given, and on the circumstances with which they were connected: and, 2, On the various names, sometimes found attached to persons or places, which has by some been termed *Polyonymia.*

20th, With respect to the persons by whom proper names have been imposed, they are various, as likewise have been the occasions on which they have been given. In some instances, *God* himself gave the name: in others, the *Father*, *Mother*, or some one or other of the kindred.

Of the first, examples may be found in Gen. xvi. 11, xvii. 19, 1 Kings xiii. 2, 1 Chron. xxii. 9, Matt. i. 21, Luke i. 13, &c. Of the second and third,* examples occur very frequently; and of the last, Luke i. 59, may suffice.†

21st, The material causes, or circumstances, connected with the imposition of proper names amount, according to Simonis, to fifteen.‡ These, however, may all be reduced to the original number assumed by Glassius, which is two.§ "1. κατ' ἔσω, vel ratione *etymi* et significationis, ejusque fundamenti. 2. κατ' ἔξω, vel ratione *extensionis ad alia*, et communionis."

22d. In the first place, proper names both of *men* and *places*, were first given with reference to some event, either *past*, *present*, or *future*, with regard to such person or place.

23d, Of the first sort, are the following: Gen. xvii. 17, 19, יִצְחָק *Isaac*, so called on account of Abraham's *smiling*‖ upon receiving the promise of his birth; Exod. ii. 10, *Moses* (מֹשֶׁה) is so called on account of his having been taken out of the water, as the text shews, whether the word itself be Egyptian or Hebrew: for, on this subject learned men differ.

---

* Simonis, p. 13.

† Gen. xxix. xxx., 1 Sam. i. 20, 1 Chron. iv. 9.

‡ Onom. pp. 14, 15, &c.

§ Append. Gram. Tract. iii. p. 709, Ed. Dathe.

‖ "Risus Abrahæ exsultatio est gratulantis, non irrisio diffidentis." Eucherius apud Glass. Append. Gram. Tract. iii. p. 711.

1 Sam. iv. 21, *Í-kāvód* (אִי כָבוֹד) *where is the glory?* on account of the ark of the covenant having been taken.

24th, Secondly, Of names taken from *present* circumstances, the following are examples: Gen. iv. 2, הֶבֶל *vanity*, on account, as it has been thought, of the *vanity* and *instability* of all human things, which had been occasioned by the fall; Gen. iv. 25, *Seth* (שֵׁת) because God had *placed* him in the situation of Abel, who had been murdered by Cain; Gen. xxv. 25, *Esau* (עֵשָׂו), whether we deduce it from עשי عشي, as Dathe will have it, which signifies *to cover*, &c., or from عثا عثي *to have long hair*, after Simonis; Ib. ver. 26, *Jacob*, יַעֲקֹב from עָקֵב *the heel*, because he took hold of his brother's heel at the time of his birth. Another instance is, that which is said to have taken place at the time of the birth of Gad, Gen. xxx. 11, to which many others might be added.

25th, The following names appear to have been given with reference to something which was to take place afterwards: Gen. iii. 20, *Eve* (חַוָּה), because she was to be the mother of all men who should live; Gen. v. 29, *Noah* (נֹחַ), because he was to be the means of *consoling* the true believers. In this case, as we shall see hereafter, the verb used to explain this proper name, is not the same with that included in the name itself, which signifies *quiet*, *rest*, &c. The only thing intended by the sacred Writer seems to be on this, as on many other occasions, to give the general sense, and not the mere etymology, of the word.

26th, The following are examples of names of places given with reference to certain events.

Gen. iv. 16, *Nód* (נוֹד) is the place in which Cain is said to have resided, after he had been driven out from the presence of God, the meaning of which is, *wandering* or *wanderer*.

Gen. xi. 9, *Babel* (בָּבֶל) was so called, on account of the confusion of languages which took place there, from בַּלְבֵּל, a reduplicated form of בָּלַל *to mix, confound*, &c. which, by contraction, will become בָּבֶל.

Gen. xxviii. 19, *Bethel* (בֵּית־אֵל) was so called by Jacob, because he deemed it worthy of being called the house of God, on account of the vision he had seen there. Similar examples are to be found, Gen. xxxii. 3; with respect to *Mākhănáim*, Ib. xxxi. 47; *Galeed*, John v. 2,

where *Bethesda* is intended to point out the favour of God, exerted at that place, as in *a house of mercy*. In Exod. xv. and Num. xxxiii. we have several examples of names thus given to the different stations in the wilderness, at which the Israelites halted.

It should be observed, that in writing Hebrew names in Greek letters, the aspirates are frequently omitted: as, Ἐσρὼμ, not Χεσρὼμ; Ναασσὼν, not Ναχσὼν; and so of others.

LECTURE IX.

ON THE SEPARABLE AND INSEPARABLE PARTICLES.

179. These are nothing more than either words, or fragments of words, attached to others, for the purpose of qualifying or otherwise restricting them; and they are written either separately, or both together forming one compound word, according to usage. In this point of view, therefore, they may be classed under one or other of the forms of nouns already detailed; but, as they occur very frequently, and exert a very great influence on the force and bearing of the context, they deserve a separate consideration.

2d, By Particles are meant words, used occasionally as *Pronouns, Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions,* or *Interjections.* We say occasionally, because some of them will fill one or more of these offices, as the context shall require, just as these words often do among ourselves.

3d, That the *Separable Prepositions* are words of this kind, I think, there cannot remain a shadow of doubt, when we consider, that in many instances they really present all the peculiarities of nouns put in the state of construction: as, בְּדִי־רִיק *for vanity,* or, *in sufficientiam vanitatis,** Jer. li. 58; so בֵּין הַמַּיִם *between the waters,* Gen. i. 7;† or, *distinctio aquarum:* דֵּי

---

* Nold. sub voce בְּדִי in notis, "דֵּי Est absoluti דַּי constructum."

† Ib. sub. v. בֵּין "Constituit substantivum nomen masculinum, cujus pluralis masc. est בֵּינִים, &c.... atque inde nominalem significationem, quam vix unquam exuit.... *discrimen differentiam* rerum, qua a se invicem distinguuntur."

(for הַיּוֹם) being the absolute form in the one case, and בֵּן in the other, which in construction regularly become דֵּי and בֵּין respectively (Art. 151. 6.). And, *vice versâ*, words preceding these particles* are often found taking the forms proper for the state of construction: as חוֹסֵי בוֹ Ps. ii. 12; מְשׂוֹשׂ אֶת־רְצִין *Delight of Rezin*, Is. viii. 6, &c., which seems to intimate that they are nouns.

4th, In the Arabic and Ethiopic dialects, also, in each of which we have a peculiarity of termination, by which nouns in construction are distinguished, these particles are clearly marked as being in that state: as, in the Arabic, امام المسجد *before the mosque*, (i. e. pars. *anterior templi*,) where the last word is put in the genitive case, as being in construction with the preceding. So in the Ethiopic, ወሰተ፡ ሰማይ፡ *to*, or *towards*, *heaven*: where the first has this mark: and generally, all words of this kind, whether prepositions or adverbs, are always found with the termination proper for construction, unless they happen to be the last in a sentence.

With respect to the adverbs, as they can be known to be such, only from the situations in which they are found, and may consist of almost any form suitable to the sense required, enough will be said on their character and use in the Syntax.

5th, If, then, these particles were originally nouns, it is likely we should find them exhibiting the simple and augmented forms peculiar to nouns; and such is actually the case, as the following examples will evince. Segolates: טֶרֶם *not yet*; אֶצֶל *near, at*; נֶכַח *before, in presence of*; חֵלּוֹם *here, hither*; רַק *only*; אַל,† בַּל,‡ *by no means*. Pri-

---

* These particles are ב, כ, ל, מ or מִן, אֶל, אֵת, עַל, בִּלְתִּי, Glass. Phil. Sacr. p. 80, &c. Storr. Observ. p. 105.

† This word is probably an abridged form of אָלָה *execration*, thence, *deprecation, prohibition*, or the like; or, from one or other of the Cognate roots, אלל, אול, יאל, which will afford similar significations. See these roots in Castell and Simonis.

‡ בַּל proprie *defectus*, sed in particulam abit .. notans *non*. Simonis Lex. sub voce בָּלָה *attritus fuit*.

mitive nouns, not Segolate: as, יוֹתֵר *more*; סָבִיב *round about*; מְהֵרָה (fem.) *quickly, soon*; רַבָּה (root רבב) *much*; זוּלָת *besides*, to which many others might be added.

The following are augmented by one or other of the letters termed חֶאֱמַנְתִּי (Art. 165.); פִּתְאֹם *suddenly, immediately*; חִנָּם *gratis, freely* (Art. 175.); אוּלַי *perhaps*, (which is probably a compound of או לי, Arab. ولو); אַחַר (for אַחַר) *after, afterwards*.

6th, Many of these particles are found in the plural number, (a sufficient proof, if any were wanting, that they are nouns); as, בֵּין, fem. בֵּינָה *distinction, between*, pl. בֵּינִים, and בֵּינוֹת. So masc. סָבִיב, fem. סְבִיבָה, pl. סְבִיבוֹת *surroundings, enclosures*, adv. or prep. *round about*; אַחַר, pl. אַחֲרִים, and, in construction, אַחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ *after the king*, q. d. *subsequutionibus regis*.

7th, In many instances these words present themselves in a compound state: as, לְמַעַן (comp. of ל, for לוי, and מען, of מ and עָנָה *answer,*) *on account of, because of*, &c.; מִפְּנֵי (of מִן and פְּנִים) *because of*; בִּלְעֲדֵי, or מִבַּלְעֲדֵי *besides, except*: and, further, with another particle, הֲמִבַּלְעֲדֵי *whether besides?* In this last case, the simplest form בִּלְעַד is perhaps a compound of three primitives, viz. of עד *usque ad*, &c. ל, and ב, which are used as prepositions. In some of the others, also, we have the preposition מ, and the interrogative particle ה, with the word also put in the plural number and in the form proper for construction.

8th, In some instances, several of these words will be found construed together, and qualifying one another: in all of which, those that are capable of receiving any variation, from being put in the state of construction, will invariably take that form. Of this sort are the following: עַד אֵין, עַד בִּלְתִּי *until . . . not*; עַד הֵנָּה, and contracted, עָדֶנָּה and עֲדֶנָּה Eccles. iv. 2, 3; עַד כֹּה, עַד כֵּן *hitherto*; עַד מְאֹד *to excess*; עַד מָתַי *How long? Usquequo?* עַד עַתָּה *until now*, ἕως τοῦ νῦν; עַד לְמַעְלָה *to the summit*; עַד אֲשֶׁר, עַד־אֵם, עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם, עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם *until*; בִּלְתִּי אִם *unless*; אִם לֹא *if not*; לֹא כֵן *not so*; כְּמוֹ כֵן *even so*; עַד כִּי and לְבַד מִן and מִלְבַד *besides, except*, &c.

9th, These particles are also found in construction with the pronouns, sometimes in the singular, and at others in the plural, number: as, בֵּינְךָ *between thee*; בֵּינֵינוּ, and fem. בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ *between us*. So אֶצְלָם *near them*; לְמַעַנְךָ *on account of thee*; אֵינָם, and אֵינֵימוֹ, *they are not*. The following, when in the plural number only, take the affixed pro-

nouns singular or plural, viz. אַחַר *after*; אַחֲרֶיךָ *after thee*; אֶל *to*; עַל *above, upon*; עַד *to*; בִּלְעָדֵי *besides*; and, according to Schrœderus, אַשְׁרֵי *the blessings of!* לִפְנֵי *before*; מִפְּנֵי *on account of.*

10th, The pronominal affixes attached to some of these particles differ, in some respects, from those usually attached to nouns: e. g. תַּחְתֵּנִי *under* or *beneath me*, for תַּחְתַּי; הִנֵּנִי for הִנְנִי *behold me*; הִנֵּהוּ for הִנְהוּ *behold him*; עִמָּהֶם for עִמָּם *with them*; אֶתְהֶם, masc. and אֶתְהֶן fem. *them*, or *as it respects them*, for אֶתָם, or אֶתָן.

11th, The particle אֵת, generally placed before any noun which is the object of some verb in the sentence, and used apparently for the purpose of pointing out this particular, appears in three different forms when in construction with the pronouns; which, Schrœderus thinks, has arisen from the circumstance of the root being originally of three distinct forms: viz. אָתַה, אָתַת, or אָתָה *to proceed, come*, &c.*

In the first place, we have אִתְּכֶם *you*; אִתָּם *them*, masc. אִתָּהֶן *them*, fem., from the root אָתָה. Secondly, אִתִּי *with me*; אִתְּךָ *with thee*, masc., אִתָּךְ *id.* fem.: אִתּוֹ *with him*; אִתָּהּ *with her*; אִתָּנוּ *with us*; אִתְּכֶם *with you*; אִתָּם *with them*, from the root אָתַת. Thirdly, אוֹתִי, אוֹתְךָ *thee*, or *with thee*; אוֹתָךְ *thee*, or *with thee*; אוֹתוֹ *him*, or *with him*. So אוֹתָהּ, אוֹתָנוּ, אוֹתְכֶם, אוֹתָהֶן, אוֹתָם, אוֹתָהֶן, or אוֹתָן. In all which cases, *coming to, as it respects*, or the like, will generally give the sense of the particle.

---

* D. Kimchi has remarked in the Michlol, (fol. רנט verso) כמו שתאמר ראובן הרג שמעון לא נודע מי החורג ומי ההרוג וכשתאמר ראובן הרג את שמעון הנה מלת את נופל על הפעול ונודע כי שמעון הוא ההרוג לפיכך בדבר שהוא מבואר מי הפועל והפעול לא הוצרכו למלת את: So, should you say, ראובן הרג שמעון *Reuben slew Simeon*, it would not be known who was the slayer, or who the slain. But when you say Reuben slew את Simeon, (i. e. Simeonem,) the particle את points out the objective case, and it is known that Simeon is the person slain. In like manner, in a matter in which the agent and patient are evident, the particle את is unnecessary.

Similar to this is the doctrine taught by the Persian Grammarians, on the use of the particle را, (originally, perhaps, راه *way*,) for where, according to Mr. Lumsden, there would be a difficulty in ascertaining from the context, which is the objective case to the verb, this particle is added; and, when it is not so, the particle is always to be omitted. Pers. Gram. vol. ii. p. 202. My edition of Sir Wm. Jones's Pers. Gram. p. 130—1. See the Syntax of the present work.

12th, Some have supposed, that this particle is derived from a word signifying *substance*: and, that when it is prefixed to any word, it is intended to intimate the *very substance*, matter, or the like, of which such thing consists. Hence they have interpreted Genesis i. 1, בָּרָא אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ "He created the *substance* of the heavens, and the *substance* of the earth;" than which nothing can be more fanciful, which the comparison of a very few passages under this particle in Noldius will be sufficient to shew. (Page 125, Edit. 1734: see also Note *a*, and the Vindiciæ, Art. 572.).

13th, Some of these particles take (ו) as the vowel of union before the affixed pronouns נוּ and הוּ: as, עִמָּנוּ *with us*; אִתָּנוּ *id.*: אוֹתָנוּ *us*, or *with us*; אִתּוֹ *with thee*, fem. אִתָּהּ; and אוֹתוֹ *id.* So חִנָּהוּ *behold thee*, fem.; עוֹדֶנּוּ *hitherto thou*, fem.; עִמָּךְ *with thee*, fem.; עִמָּכֶם *with you*, masc.; עִמָּהֶם *with them*, masc.

14th, The preposition מִן *out, out of*, apparently from the Arabic root מָנַן *cut*, doubles the נ by *Dāgésh*, whenever any one of the pronouns is affixed: as, מִנִּי or מֻנִּי *from me*; מִנְּהוּ or מֻנְּהוּ (for מִנָּהוּ) *from him*; מִנָּהֶם *from them*. But more frequently, according to Schrœderus, the root assumes a reduplicated form, and drops its final letter: as, מִמֶּן for מִנְמֶן (Art. 82.), and, with the affixed pronouns, מִמֶּנִּי (for מִנְמֶנִּי) *from me*; מִמֶּךָּ *from thee*; מִמֶּנּוּ *from him*; מִמֶּנָּה *from her*; מִמֶּנּוּ *from us*: and, by a further abbreviation by syncope, מִמְּךָ *from thee*, masc.; and מִמֵּךְ *from thee*, fem.

15th, The other prepositions take the affixed pronouns regularly, and, for the most part, in the plural number: as, אֶל *to, towards*, pl.; אֵלַי *to me*; עַל *upon, against*; plural, עָלֶיךָ *upon*, or *against thee*; עַד *to, usque ad*, plural; עָדָיו *to him*; בִּלְעָדַי *besides*; בִּלְעָדֶיךָ *besides thee*. With the grave affix: אֲלֵיכֶם *to you*; עֲלֵיהֶם *upon them*.

16th, The remaining prepositions are; בַּעֲבוּר *on account of*; בְּעַד *by, through*; חוּץ *without, foras, extra*; לִפְנֵי *before, in front of*; מוּל *towards, over against*; עֵבֶר *on this side, beyond* (properly, *passage*); נֶגֶד *before, in front of*; נֶכַח *id.* Those which appear in a mutilated state will be mentioned hereafter.

On the Inseparable Particles.

179. Having stated the nature, and given some examples of construction, of the *Separable* particles, we now come to those which have been termed *Inseparable*.

The reason of their being so called seems to be this; many of them are no longer found extant in their original and complete forms, but consisting of one single letter only, which is always prefixed to some other word. These particles are all comprehended in the technical terms מֹשֶׁה וְכָלֵב *Moses and Caleb.*

2d, The first (מ) is regularly prefixed to nouns with the imperfect vowel (·) *Khīrík* and, consequently, inserting *Dāgésh forte* in the following letter: as, מִדֶּרֶךְ *from*, or *out of, the way.* This word when written at length is מִן, probably from מנן, signifying, according to Storr, *cutting off*, &c.* This *Dāgésh*, therefore, may be considered as a compensation for the loss of the letter נ (Art. 82.).

3d, *Dāgésh*, however, is frequently omitted when the following word has (ּ): as, מִגְּבוּרָה *from greatness;* מִימִינוֹ *from his right hand* (for מִיְּמִינוֹ Art. 93. 5.). Under this rule Schrœderus places the word לְמַרְאשׁוֹנָה *thence, from the beginning*, 1 Chron. xv. 13. But here, the מ prefixed may be a part of מָה *which, what*, or the like, which I am inclined to believe is the case.

4th, But, when a letter follows incapable of receiving *Dāgésh* (Art. 115.), a compensation is made, either explicitly, or implicitly: i. e. either, 1st, by putting the vowel (ֻ) instead of *Khīrík;* or, 2dly, by considering the following letter as being doubled: as, 1st. as, מֵאִישׁ (for מֵאִישׁ) *from the man;* מֵרָשָׁע (for מֵרָשָׁע) *from a wicked* (man); or, 2dly, מִחוּט (for מִחְוּט) *from the thread.*

5th, The particle שׁ, which is an abbreviation of אֲשֶׁר *who, what*, &c. will be considered with the demonstrative pronouns; where the use of the particle ה will also be shewn.

On the Particle ו and, but, moreover, *&c.*

181. This particle is probably a fragment of the word אוה, Syriac ܐܘ, or Arabic أَوِيَ, which means, *to augment, connect,* &c.: in its augmented form אַוָּה *desiring wealth, connection,* or the like: and, in the noun וָו *a hook, nail,* or any thing by which one thing

* See last Art. No. 14.

is connected with another. Hence, it is used as a conjunction is in other languages; and is capable of all the variety of meaning to which such words are subject.

2d, This particle is generally prefixed to any word with (ּ): as, וְאָמַר קָרָא *he called and said;* וְעֶבֶד שִׁפְחָה *a servant maid and man.*

3d, The *Shĕvá,* however, in this case, is liable to certain changes: when, for instance, the word to which ו is thus attached commences also with *Shĕvá,* this ו takes the vowel *Shūrék:* as, וּלְכוּ *go ye,* not וְלְכוּ (by Art. 112.): וּלְמֶלֶךְ * *and to,* or *for, the king,* not וְלְמֶלֶךְ.

4th, The same change takes place, whenever any one of the labial letters (בומף) immediately follows: as, וּבֶגֶד *and the garment,* not וְבֶגֶד. There are, however, some exceptions: as, וָבֹהוּ *and void;* וָבשׁוּ *and they blushed,* &c.

5th, When the letter י having (ִ) follows, a contraction will take place (Art. 93. 5.): as, וְיִחִי (for וְיִחְיִי or וְוִחְיִי) *and he shall live;* וִימִינָם (for וְוִמִינָם) *and their right hand.* In a few cases we have (ֶ) in this place: as, וְתֵיתֵר *and let him be.*

6th, Any word beginning with one of the substitutes of *Shĕvá,* will prefix ו with the correspondent imperfect vowel (Art. 113. 3.): as, וַאֲנִי *and I;* וַאֲמֶת *and truth,* &c.

7th, In some instances of this kind, however, we find *Shūrék:* as, וּזָהָב *and gold,* Gen. ii. 12; וּצְעָקִי *and cry thou* (fem.), Jer. xxii. 20.

8th, When such word commences with א a contraction is often found to take place: as, וַאדֹנִי *and my Lord* (for וַאֲדֹנִי); so וֵאלֹהִים *and God* (for וַאֱלֹהִים), Art. 93. 5.

9th, Monosyllables, and dissyllables having the accent on the penultima, generally prefix this particle with (ַ): as, וָסוּס *and a horse;* וָאַיִל *and a ram.* To this, however, there are many exceptions: as, וְשׁוֹר *and an ox;* וְרֶכֶב *and a chariot.*

10th, This particle has been supposed to have the power of changing the tenses of the verb, making a preterite tense future, and a future preterite; and hence has been termed *Vaw Conversivum.* From what will be said on the doctrine of the tenses of the verbs in the Syntax, it will

---

* Kimchi is of opinion, that in these cases, the letter א is to be considered as dropped, and that we should read אוּ universally.

appear, that this conversive power supposed to exist in this particle is neither necessary nor true. When it takes the vowel *Pāthákh* it ought perhaps to be considered as *illative*, corresponding to the Arabic فَ, which is regularly so: when it takes (:), as merely conjunctive (p. 53, note.).

11th, In some instances, the *Dāgésh* of the following letter, no less than the Euphonic accent, one or other of which is necessary to complete the syllable, is dropped, probably by the negligence of the scribes: as, וַיְקַדֵּשׁ *and he consecrated*, Gen. ii. 3. for וַיְקַדֵּשׁ, or more regularly וַיְקַדֵּשׁ.

12th, In the first person singular of the present tense this particle takes (ָ): as, וָאֶשְׁמַע *and I hear*.

182. The remaining particles ב, כ, and ל, signifying, *in, according to, to, for,* or the like, respectively, may be easily traced to their origin as nouns. The first is probably a fragment of the word בּוֹא *entering into*, &c., which is found in Arabic under the forms of بَوِي *he descended to his house, lodging*, &c.; بِ or بَ and in Ethiopic ΩΦΑ: meaning nearly the same thing.

2d, With respect to the second (כְּ) signifying *like, as, just as*, &c., it is probably a fragment of some primitive noun, from which we also have the words כֹּה *thus*; כִּי *for, so*; כֵּן and כֵּן *thus*.

3d, These particles are regularly prefixed with (:); as, בְּדֶרֶךְ *in the way*; כְּעֵץ *like a tree*; לָאָרֶץ *to the earth*.

If the word, to which either of them is to be prefixed, have (:), the particle will regularly take (·) *Khīrík* (Art. 112.): as, בִּמְגִלָּה *in the volume*; כִּכְלִי *like a vessel*; לִבְנוֹ *to his son*.

4th, But, when any one of the substitutes of *Shĕvá* happens to be the first vowel of such word, the prefix will take the correspondent imperfect vowel (Art. 113. 3.): as, בַּחֲלוֹם *in a dream*; כַּאֲכוֹל *like eating*, &c.

5th, When א happens to be the first letter, a contraction generally

takes place: as, לַאדֹנָי (for לַאֲדֹנָי) *to my Lord*; לֵאלֹהִים (for לֵאֱלֹהִים) *to God* (Art. 93. 5.).

6th, But, when prefixed to monosyllables, or to dissyllables having the accent in the penultimate, they generally take (ר) as above (Art. 180. 9.); e. g. בָּזֶה *in this*; כָּאֵלֶּה *like these*; לָנֶצַח *for ever*. So with verbal nouns or Infinitives, when not in construction with other nouns: as, לָקוּם *for standing*; לָלֶכֶת *for walking*.

7th, The following affixed pronouns are often found attached to these particles: viz. בִּי *in me*; בָּנוּ *in us*; בְּךָ *in thee*, masc.; בָּךְ *id.* fem.; בָּכֶם *in you*, masc.; בָּכֶן *id.* fem.; בּוֹ *in him*, masc.; בָּהּ *in her*; בָּהֶם (or Art. 81.); בָּם *in them*, masc.; בָּהֶן *id.* fem.

8th, The particle ל receives the pronouns in the same manner; but, כ is so found in only two instances; viz. כָּכֶם *like you*, and כָּהֶם *like them*. When it is necessary to use the pronouns with כ, the paragogic particle מוֹ is generally introduced thus: כָּמוֹנִי *like me*; כָּמוֹנוּ *like us*; כָּמוֹךָ *like thee*; כְּמוֹכֶם *like you*; כָּמוֹהוּ *like him*; כָּמוֹהָ *like her*; כְּמוֹהֶם *like them*.

9th, When either of the particles ב, כ, or ל, is prefixed to a noun with the definite article, the article is for the most part rejected (Art. 79.) and the particle takes its vowel: as, בַּבַּיִת *in the house* (for בְּהַבַּיִת); כָּאִישׁ *like the man* (for כְּהָאִישׁ); לַחֹדֶשׁ *for the month* (for לְהַחֹדֶשׁ); בֶּחָרָבָה *in the dry* (land, for בְּהֶחָרָבָה Art. 93. 6.). Exceptions: בְּהַדֶּרֶךְ *in the way*, Neh. ix. 19; לְהָעָם *to the people*, 2 Chron. x. 7; כְּהַחַלֹּנוֹת *like the windows*, Ezek. xl. 25; כְּהֶחָכָם *like the wise man*, Eccles. viii. 1.

10th, This contraction, moreover, frequently takes place in those Infinitives which commence with a servile ה: as, בְּכָשֵׁל (for בְּהִכָּשֵׁל) *in being impelled*, Prov. xxiv. 17; לַשְׁמִיעַ (for לְהַשְׁמִיעַ) *for causing to hear*, Ps. xxvi. 7; לָבִיא (for לְהָבִיא) *for bringing*, Jer. xxxix. 7, &c., though not regularly so.

On those Inseparable Particles which are termed Paragogic.

183. To the preceding class of inseparable particles may be added another, which, however, are always found attached to the end, not to the beginning, of a word; and for the purpose, most probably, of adding something

to the sense of the passage in which they are found. These were at first, perhaps, nouns in construction just as the prepositions were; but which, in after times, were abbreviated for the sake of convenience.

2d, These letters or syllables, then, (for they are now nothing more) have been termed *paragogic*, rather, I suppose, for the purpose of giving them a name, than for pointing out either their nature or their use, are, according to Schrœderus, אהוין, and are found appended to words, either for the purpose of giving emphasis to the meaning, of promoting euphony, or by way of pleonasm.

On א *when Paragogic.*

3d, This letter is mostly pleonastic, and is found attached to words having (ה) or ו for their terminating vowel: as, אַתִּיקֶיהָא *its galleries* (for אַתִּיקֶיהָ), Ezek. xli. 15; הָהָלְכוּא *they who went* (for הָהָלְכוּ), Josh. x. 24; אָבוּא *they were willing*, Isai. xxviii. 12; יִנָּשׂוּא *they shall be carried*, Jer. x. 5. So יְהוּא for יְהוּ (for יִהְיֶה, Art. 93. 2.) *he shall be*, Eccl. xi. 3; also הוּא, instead of הוּ *he*, Arab. هُوَ; לוּא for לוּ Arab. لَوْ *would to God, utinam*, &c., and so of others.*

On the Paragogic ה.

184. The use of ה as a paragogic letter is very frequent. In some cases it is thought to augment the signification, in others to be merely pleonastic; but, as

---

* This prevails in the Arabic, whence Schultens comes to the conclusion, that it is an ancient manner of writing: others, that it is a mere Arabism.

writers differ very much in their opinions, we shall determine nothing on this subject.

2d, On some occasions, it is found appended to words ending in a consonant, with (ָ): on others, it is preceded by (ֵ) or (ֶ): and in these it becomes quiescent: as, אֲסַפְּרָה (from אֲסַפֵּר) *I will recount*, Ps. ii. 7; אַרְצָה (from אֶרֶץ) *the earth*; הִנֵּה (from הֵן) *behold*; אֵלֶּה (from אֵל) *these*.

3d, It is found attached to verbs. 1st, to the Infinitive or Verbal noun; 2d, to both the tenses; 3d, to the second person singular masculine of the Imperative; and, 4th, to the participles: e. g. 1st. פְּשָׁטָה (for פְּשֹׁט) *spoiling*; רֶגֶזָה (for רְגֹז) *shaking*, Isa. xxxii. 11; שְׁאֵלָה (for שְׁאֹל) *asking*, Isa. vii. 11, &c. 2d. נָחָה (for נָח) *he has rested*, Isa. vii. 2; לָנָה (for לָן) *he lodged*, Zech. v. 4; הִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה (for הִשְׁלַכְתֶּן) *ye cast*; נִשְׂרְפָה (for נִשְׂרֹף) *let us burn*, Gen. xi. 3; יְדַשְּׁנָה (for יְדַשֵּׁן) *he will reduce to ashes*, Ps. xx. 4, &c.

4th, Verbs ending in ה, usually drop that letter upon receiving the paragogic ה: as, אֶשְׁעָה (for אֶשְׁעֶהָ Art. 81.) *I will look on, observe*, Ps. cxix. 117. So נִשְׁתָּעֶה (for נִשְׁתָּעֶהָ) *we will observe*, Isa. xli. 23. This last example Schrœderus puts under the form of apocope, which appears to me to be a distinction without a difference. This letter is also frequently added when the feminine pronoun is struck out: as, יִבְלָעֶנָּה (for יִבְלָעֶנְהָ) *he shall swallow her up*.

5th, With Imperatives: as, שָׁכְבָה *repose thou* (for שְׁכַב), Gen. xxxix. 7; אֶסְפָּה (for אֱסֹף) *collect*, Num. xi. 16: שָׁמְרָה (for שְׁמֹר) *keep*, Ps. xxv. 20; הַקְשִׁיבָה (for הַקְשֵׁיב) *attend*, Ps. v. 3; לְכָה (for לֵךְ), and with ה omitted לֵךְ *go*, Num. xxiii. 13. So אִכָּבְדָ (for אִכָּבְדָה, from אִכָּבֵד) *I will be honoured*, Hag. i. 8.

6th, With Participles: as, בֹּעֲרָה (from בֹּעֵר) *burning*, Hos. vii. 4; נִמְלָטָה (from נִמְלָט) *escaped*, Jer. xlviii. 19.

7th, Nouns singular of both genders, as also nouns masculine of the dual and plural numbers, will receive a paragogic ה, still preserving the accent on the originally accentuated syllable: as, לַיְלָה (from לַיִל) *the night*; עַוְלָתָה (from עַוְלָה) *iniquity*; מִצְרַיְמָה

(from מִצְרַיִם) *Egypt*; יָמִימָה (from יָמִים) *days*. Any noun, however, ending in an imperfect vowel on account of construction (Art. 151. 3.), will, when the paragogic ה is added, take the accent on the last syllable: as, מִזְרָחָה (from מִזְרָח, in construction מִזְרַח) *the rising of the sun*, Deut. iv. 41, &c.

8th, Neither the paragogic ה, nor its vowel, will undergo any change on account of the state of construction: as, Ib. מִזְרָחָה שֶׁמֶשׁ, as above: אַרְצָה הַנֶּגֶב *the southern country*, Gen. xx. 1; הָאֹהֱלָה שָׂרָה *the tent of Sarah*, Gen. xxiv. 67.

9th, This particle is also added to certain pronouns, whether separate or affixed: as, 1st, אַתֶּנָּה *you*, fem.; הֵמָּה *they*, masc.; הֵנָּה *they*, fem.; אֵלֶּה *these*, com. 2d, לָכֶנָּה *to you*; זִמָּתְכֶנָּה *your* (fem.) *wickedness*, &c.

10th, Schrœderus thinks, that we have in אֶמְאָסְאֵהּ Hos. iv. 6, *I will despise thee*, an instance in which ה paragogic has been changed to א on account of its standing in the middle of a word. Whether this be the case or not, it is certain that there is a various reading in this place, which makes the passage of too doubtful a character to allow of a rule being formed upon it.

11th, It will not be necessary to trouble the Reader with instances, in which this particle is found attached to other particles: as, שָׁמָּה for שָׁם *there*, &c.: because, as these are manifestly nothing more than nouns, it is reasonable enough to expect, that they may receive ה paragogic as well as other nouns.

12th, Schrœderus, Schultens, and some others have thought, that this particle has, at one time, the force of a demonstrative pronoun; at another, that of confirmation or asseveration: at another, an optative signification; that it is, at another, intensitive; and equivalent, at another, to the Latin *versus;* and at another, to the preposition ב *in* (Sect. ix. Instit. Gram. Reg. 165, &c.). Whether this be really the case or not, it is extremely difficult to say: certainly, it is not very evident from the passages adduced by them. And, although we are disposed to believe, that in some instances it is equivalent to the Chaldee or Syriac article א similarly situated; yet, it may be doubted, whether a case can be fairly made out, in which the variety of shades of meaning just mentioned can be established.

13th, The following are undoubted instances of pleonasm: i. e. in which this letter adds nothing whatever to the sense: viz. אַתָּה for אַתְּ *thou*; נָתַתָּה for נָתַתְּ *thou gavest*; יָדָהּ for יָדְךָ *thy hand*;

to which many more might be added. So in עָלָה for עָלוּ *they ascended*, 2 Kings xxiv. 10; וְהָיָה for וְהָיוּ *and they shall be*, Josh. xv. 4, &c. where the *Shūrék* has been supplied by (וּ).

On the Paragogic Letter ו.

185. The paragogic letter ו is sometimes found with *Khōlém*; at others, without any vowel; and, occasionally, coming between two nouns in the state of construction. It is thought by some to be nothing more than a pleonasm of the affixed pronoun (וֹ): as, בְּנוֹ בְעֹר *his son* (viz.) *of Beor*, instead of בֶּן בְּעֹר Numb. xxiv. 3, 15; חַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ *its living creature* (viz.) *the earth's*, instead of חַיַּת אֶרֶץ Gen. i. 24; לְמַעְיְנוֹ־מָיִם *into its fountain* (viz.) *of water*, for לְמַעְיַן Ps. cxiv. 8. So יַחְדָּיו and יַחְדָּו *his* (being) *alone*, Gen. xiii. 6; Ps. iv. 9, &c. See also Ps. l. 10, civ. 11, 20, lxxix. 2; Isa. lvi. 9.

2d, Professor Gesenius objects to this etymology, because the vowel points differ in some respects from those usually found with the affixed pronoun, and because the affix is also found to disagree with the noun to which it refers.* I do not think, however, that much stress can be laid on the consideration of the vowel points, because anomalies of this kind frequently occur. Nor is the disagreement of gender discoverable between the noun and the affix of much moment, it being a rule with the Hebrews, to pay but little regard either to the gender or number of the qualifying word, when added to complete a sentence, as we shall see hereafter. In the Syriac and Ethiopic, pleonasms of this kind are extremely frequent; but in general, a preposition is then added to the last word: as, ܕ̈ܘܪ̈ܐ ܕ̈ܐܠܗܐ *the gift of him, of God.* The preposition in Ethiopic is ለ in these cases. See Ludolf. Gram. Eth. p. 138.

3d, There are some instances of verbs, in which וֹ seems to be a paragogic letter: as, וַיִּכְּוֹ *and he smote*, 2 Sam. xiv. 6, root נכה, where ו is probably the true radical letter, for which ה has been sub-

* Lehrgebaüde, p. 549.

stituted: and, as *Khōlém* is most frequently the second vowel proper for the present tense, nothing can be more likely, than that ו is here made to quiesce in it. We also have וַיִּשְׁנֹא in 1 Sam. xxi. 14; probably for וַיְשַׁנֶּה *he changed*. We also have י, in like manner, not as a paragogic letter, but, as the true radical letter, in תִּמְחִי *blot out*, Jer. xviii. 23; תִּזְנִי *she committed fornication*, Ib. iii. 6.

On the Paragogic Letter י.

186. This letter, when Paragogic, is like the preceding asyllabic, and is mostly found between two nouns in the state of construction. Its vowel differs in no respect from that of the pronoun of the first person singular; whence Schultens and some of his followers have supposed it to be nothing more than a pleonasm of that pronoun. To this, however, Storr and Gesenius object, and apparently with good reason.* The Persian etymology, however, proposed by Gesenius, is, perhaps, equally objectionable, as exemplified in the phrase, بُوِي مُشْك *the scent of musk*. Whether it be the same with the يَاءُ النِّسْبَةِ, or صِنْسِ of the Arabs, which is the same with the patronymic י of the Hebrews (Art. 174.); or, whether it be that of the plural number, derived from the verbal noun הָיָה (pp. 71. 2. note), and thence applied for the purpose of giving *Emphasis, Intensity*, or the like, to any passage, it is impossible to say; but, certain it is, that the significations thus derived will suit its application sufficiently well, where any variation of sense is discoverable in consequence of its insertion.†

---

* Storr. Observationes, pp. 441. 442. Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 547.

† In some cases, however, the י so affixed, seems to be nothing more than a fragment of the feminine pronoun of the second person singular אַתְּי, as

2d, This particle is found appended both to nouns and particles: to nouns, as, אֹסְרִי .... בְּנִי אֲתֹנוֹ *binding the fole of his ass,* Gen. xlix. 11; רַבָּתִי בַגּוֹיִם *great* (fem.) *among the nations,* Lam. i. 1; קוֹלִי תַּחֲנוּנָי *the voice of my supplication,* Ps. cxvi. 1; גְּנֻבָתִי יוֹם *stolen* (fem.) *by day,* Gen. xxxi. 39; see also Deut. xxxiii. 16, Ps. cx. 4. cxiii. 5, 6, 7, 9, &c. To particles: as, מִנִּי בֶטֶן *from the belly* (for מִן), Isa. xlvi. 3; בִּלְתִּי הַיּוֹם *except to-day* (for בִּלְתְּ), Gen. xxi. 26; so זוּלָתִי *besides* (for זוּלַת), Deut. iv. 12, &c.

3d, Schrœderus and Schultens have also applied this paragogic letter to verbs; but, as it is never found, except in those which have ה for the last radical letter; and, as י is, in these cases, generally substituted for ה, there can be no doubt, that this is its office in all such instances, as Storr has justly remarked.

On the Letter ן *when Paragogic.*

187. This is mostly found with verbs: it is also found affixed to particles, preceded by (ֶ) or (-); or, when יִ- or וּ precede, it is affixed without any vowel: as, תִּתֵּן (for תִּתֶּן, on account of the accent, from תְּנָתְּ) *giving;* יְשִׁיבֶנָּה (for יְשִׁיבָה) *he shall turn her back,* Jer. ii. 24; יְתִיתֵן *it shall hang over (thee),* Hab. ii. 17;* יְכַבְּדֶנְנִי *he will honour me,* Ps. l. 23, where we have (ֶ) for (-), on account of the accent perhaps: so, תְּחִילִין (for תְּחִילִי) *thou* (fem.) *shalt bring forth,* Is. xlv. 10;

אֹהַבְתִּי (Hos. x. 11.) *thou hast loved,* for אֹהֲבָה אַתִּי, as it constantly occurs in the Syriac Participles, see the Grammars. So יֹלַדְתִּ for יוֹלֶדֶת אַתְּ *thou bringest forth,* Gen. xvi. 11. See also Jer. xxii. 23; li. 13; Mic. vii. 8, &c.

* Institutiones, &c. Schultensii. p. 428. In every instance this ן is probably nothing more than that, by which the intensitive form in nouns is sometimes designated. See Art. 176. 4.

תִּדְבָּקוּן *thou shalt adhere,* Ruth ii. 8. So, תִּירְאוּן *ye shall fear;* תִּרְאוּן *ye shall see;* יֵלְכוּן *they shall walk,* &c.

2d, Occasionally with (ֹ) when put for וּ: as, יִשְׁכְּבֹן *they shall lie down,* 1 Sam. ii. 22; יִרְוֹן *they shall be watered,* Ps. xxxvi. 9; in which cases the accent is always with the last syllable.

3d, Verbs having ה (without *Mappik*) for the third radical letter, drop it by contraction (Art. 79.) when וֹ paragogic is added: as, אַכֶּנּוּ *I will smite him,* 1 Sam. xxvi. 8 (for אַכֵּהֶנּוּ); אוֹדֶנּוּ *I will confess to him* (for אוֹדֶהֶנּוּ), Ps. xlii. 6; אֶרְאֶנּוּ (for אֶרְאֶהֶנּוּ) *I shall see him,* Numb. xxiv. 17, &c. But in these cases, there is also an affixed pronoun, the rules for the addition of which we now proceed to detail.

4th, When a paragogic וֹ is followed by either of the affixed syllabic pronouns נִי, דְּ, הוּ, or הָ, (Art. 153. 7.), no vowel of union is required: as, יְכַבְּדֵנִי *he will honour me;* אֶתֶּקְךָ *I will root thee out,* (of אֶתֵּן, from אֶתֹּק, for אֶנְתֹּק, root נתק); יְבָרְכֵהוּ *he shall bless him,* (of יְבָרֵךְ, from יְבָרְכֹהוּ, root ברך). But, if the pronoun is asyllabic, there must be a vowel of union: as, יְשָׁרְתוּנְךָ *they shall serve thee,* Isa. lx. 7.

5th, The affixed pronouns נִי, and נוּ, following the paragogic וֹ, are frequently expressed by inserting *Dāgésh forte* in the וֹ: as, דָּנַנִּי *he judged me,* (for דָּנַנְנִי, from דָּנַן, root דון). So, יִסְּרַנִּי *he chastised me,* Ps. cxviii. 18; תְּבָרְכַנִּי *it shall bless me,* Gen. xxvii. 19: יְצָרְנוּ *he shall save us,* (for יְצָרְנְנוּ, from יְצָרֵן, from יצר, root נצר); and, with the particle אַיִן *is not;* אֵינֶנִּי *my not being,* (for אֵינֶנְנִי, from אַיִן), &c.

6th, The paragogic וֹ is frequently inserted in the affix דְּ, in the same manner: as, בֵּרֶכְךָ *he has blessed thee* (for בֵּרֵכְנְךָ Art. 82.); מְיַסְּרֶךָ *chastising thee,* Deut. viii. 5; עֹנֶךָ *answering thee,* (for עֹנֵהְךָ, and rejecting ה by Art. 79. עֹנֶכְךָ, rejecting כ Art. 82. עֹנֶךָ, root ענה). So, in the particles, הִנֶּךָ *behold thou,* Ps. cxxxix. 8; אַיֶּכָּה *where* (art) *thou?* (ending also with paragogic ה Art. 183.) Gen. iii. 9.

7th, The affixes הוּ and ה are often omitted, and a compensation is made by doubling the paragogic וֹ by *Dāgésh forte:* as, תִּפְקְדֶנּוּ *thou shalt visit him,* (for תִּפְקְדֶנְהוּ, See Art. 79.), Ps. viii. 5. So,

יַכֶּנּוּ *he shall smite him*, 1 Sam. xvii. 25; קָחֶנּוּ *take him*, 1 Sam. xx. 21; אֵינֶנּוּ *he is not*, Gen. xxx. 33; עוֹדֶנּוּ *he yet* ..... Gen. xviii. 22; and, with the feminine affixed pronoun יִבְלָעֶנָּה *he shall swallow her up* (for יִבְלָעֶנְהָ), Isa. xxviii. 4; so קָחֶנָּה *take it*, Jer. xxxvi. 14; תְּתֶנָּה *give it*, 1 Sam. xxi. 10; אֵינֶנָּה *it is not*, Lev. xiii. 21. In these cases, Schrœderus is of opinion, that the ה of the feminine pronoun has been struck out, and that the paragogic ה has been added. Storr, however, is of a different opinion; his words are: "Similiter *He paragogicum*, in voce אֶשְׁעָה, Ps. cxix. 117, et similibus dubitationem habet, quoniam præter formam אֶשְׁעָה, ad quam *He* adjunctum videri possit, etiam alia datur, in *Kamez* desinens," &c. p. 440, note.

8th, When the affix וֹ (which has always the accent) follows the paragogic וֹ, there is no vowel of union: as, קָבְנוֹ *curse him*, Numb. xxiii. 13, (for קָבְּנוֹ, root קבב). In like manner, we have יֶשְׁנוֹ *his being*, (for יֶשֵׁן, root יֵשׁ), 1 Sam. xiv. 39, &c.

9th, The force of this letter, when used with verbs, is thought to be that of Asseveration, Confirmation, or the like; though there are many instances, in which no such powers can be discovered. In the Arabic, the introduction of this letter, in verbs, universally gives *energy*, *certainty*, or the like, to the passages in which it is found; and hence it is called by the Grammarians النون التاكيدي *the Nún of confirmation*. We have seen (Art. 176.) that this particle is also added to nouns for a similar reason; whence we may perhaps infer, that it is the same particle in every case.

10th, This וֹ has by some been termed *Epenthetic*; but, as it appears to have been originally the same, in every case, it seems to be unnecessary to give it more names than one.

188. The syllables which have been termed Paragogic are, דִי, מוֹ, and פִּי, when preceded by the particles ב, כ, ל, and מ: as, בְּדִי *in*; כְּדִי *like*: כְּפִי *according to*; לְפִי *to*; בְּמוֹ *in*; כְּמוֹ *like*; לְמוֹ *to*, &c. These are mostly confined to highly energetic compositions; whence we may infer, that they were intended to add something to the signification.

2d, The first of these is thought to be the same with the word דַּי, or דַּי, signifying *sufficiency*, &c. The second, Schultens and some others, have derived from מַי, or מוֹ *water*; while Jahn thinks it is

the same with מֶה, or מָה *what, which,* &c. In the Arabic مَا, مَا, is frequently found attached to the same particles: as, بِمَا, كَمَا, لَمَا, i. e. *in that which, according to that which, to,* or *for, that which,* &c. So in the Syriac, ܟܡܐ *kĕmó;* ܒܡܐ *bĕmó,* &c. having the same signification.*

3d, The particle פִּי is nothing more than another form of פֶּה *the mouth,* found in construction with other nouns. Its meaning, by a metonymy, will be, *any thing said, enforced,* or *commanded:* as, *a precept, edict,* &c. which will not always bear to be expressed in a translation.

On the Demonstrative Pronouns.

189. The Demonstrative Pronouns are always found written separately, and they are as follows:—

זֶה masc., זֹאת fem.; rarely זוֹ or זֶהּ; הַלָּז or זוּ *this,* sing. com.: אֵלֶּה, rarely אֵל *these,* pl. com.

2d, The forms לָזֶה, הַלָּזֶה, masc. *this,* have the additional particle ל *to,* or *for,* with the definite article ה *the.* The same may be said of הַלָּזוֹ *this,* fem. which occurs but once, viz. Ezek. xxxvi. 35, as also of הַלָּז, of the common gender, as above.

3d, הָאֵל *these,* is also found; it is nothing more than the plural pronoun, as above, with the article prefixed.

4th, זֶה, however, is also found construed as a plural, Gen. xxvii. 36, 1 Sam. xxix. 3, Job xix. 19, and Zech. i. 12, vii. 5. אֵלֶּה is also found as a singular, 1 Chron. xi. 11, 2 Chron. iii. 3, xvii. 14, and Ezra i. 9.

---

* It is very possible, however, that the מ in these instances, the כ in many of those just preceding, as well as the same letters terminating the plural numbers of nouns, may have been added for the mere purposes of euphony. See p. 70. note.

On the Relative Pronoun.

190. The Hebrew language recognises but one Relative Pronoun: viz. אֲשֶׁר *he who, that which, what,* which is common to every gender and number.

2d, The gender and number, however, will be pointed out by that of the preceding or following noun or pronoun: as, אֲשֶׁר הָעֹמְדִים *who stand,* i. e. they (masc.) who stand, 1 Kings xii. 8; אֲשֶׁר קָצִירוֹ *who his harvest,* i. e. *whose harvest,* Job v. 5; אֲשֶׁר תִּדְּפֶנּוּ רוּחַ *which* (masc.) *the wind disperses it,* i. e. *which* (masc.) *the wind disperses,* Ps. i. 4; בְּאַרְצָם .... אֲשֶׁר *in whose land,* Joel iv. 19.

3d. In some instances, indeed, the demonstrative pronouns זֶה, זוּ, and זוֹ take the place of אֲשֶׁר: as Ps. iv. 8, ix. 16, and cxxxii. 12, &c. A similar substitution takes place in Arabic, which the Grammarians ascribe to a difference of dialect.*

4th, This pronoun is frequently found prefixed to other words in an abbreviated form: as, שֶׁ, שֲׁ, שָׁ, or שְׁ, the first and last letters being rejected. Examples: שֶׁלֹּא נְתָנָנוּ, for אֲשֶׁר לֹא נְתָנָנוּ *who has not given us* (up), Ps. cxxiv. 6; שֶׁקִּוִּינוּ for אֲשֶׁר קִוִּינוּ *which we waited* (for), Lam. ii. 16; שֶׁקַּמְתִּי for אֲשֶׁר קַמְתִּי *till I arose,* Jud. v. 7; שָׁאַתָּה for אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה *which thou,*

---

* In the Arabic commentary on the *Káfia* of *Ibn Olhájib,* published at Calcutta, (p. ٢٦٩) we have the following remark: وذو الطائية . اي المنسوبة الي بني طي لاختصاص مجيئها موصولة بلغتم بمعني الذي والتي قال الشاعر . ع . وبئري ذو حفرت وذو طويت . اي التي حفرتها والتي طويتها, &c. That is, זוּ *of the tribe of Táy*: i. e. *which is referred to that tribe, on account of its peculiar usage in their dialect,* as the relative pronoun, signifying *who, which, &c. in both genders* (i. e. masc. and fem.) *The Poet has said,* ‘ *My well which* (זוּ) *I digged, and which* (זוּ) *I enclosed.*

Dathe thinks, that there is an ellipsis of אֲשֶׁר in these instances. See Glass. Philol. Sacr. ed. 1776. p. 160.

Ib. vi. 17; שֶׁהֵם for אֲשֶׁר הֵם *that they*, Eccl. iii. 18, &c. It is perhaps difficult to say, in what cases the vowel (ֶ) is to be preferred to (־); but it is not of much importance. *Kāméts* is used only when a letter incapable of receiving *Dāgésh*, follows: as, שָׁאַתָּה *which thou*, Judg. vi. 17. But, even in this case, (ֶ) is often found sustained by an accent: as, שֶׁעָלוּ *they who went up*. Nor can the usage of (ֶ) in these places be easily accounted for.

On the Interrogative Pronouns.

191. These are מִי for persons: מָה, מַה, or מֶה, *who, which, what?* הַ, הֲ, הָ, *what, whether?* and אֵי *where, how?* &c. for things: all of which are invariable, and of the common gender: as, מִי־אַתָּה *who* (art) *thou* (masc.)? Gen. xxvii. 32; מִי־אָתְּ *who* (art) *thou* (fem.)? Ruth iii. 9; מִי־אֵלֶּה *who* (are) *these?* Gen. xxxiii. 5. We also have מִי שְׁמֶךָ *what* (is) *thy name?* which Schultens says, refers to the person nevertheless: as, *Quis nomen tuum?* (Institutiones ad Fund. Ling. Heb. p. 228.). Examples with מה are: מָה עֲוֹנֵנוּ וּמָה חַטָּאתֵנוּ *What* (is) *our iniquity, and what our sin?* Jer. xvi. 10; מָה מִשְׁפַּט הָאִישׁ *what* (is) *the manner of the man?* 2 Kings i. 7; מָה קוֹל *what noise*, 1 Sam. iv. 6, 14.

2d, מָה, with *Kāméts*, is used when the article (ה), or any other letter incapable of receiving *Dāgésh*, immediately follows, excepting ח or ע: as, מָה הַבִּטָּחוֹן *what confidence?* 2 Kings xviii. 19; מָה־אֱנוֹשׁ *what* (is) *man?* Ps. viii. 5; מָה הֵנָּה *what* (are) *they* (fem.)? Isa. xli. 22; מָה הוּא־לָהּ *what he* (was) *to her*, Esth. viii. 1.

3d, Exceptions: 1. We have מַח with *Pāthákh*, notwithstanding the article following: מַח־הַמַּעַל *what prevarication?* Josh. xxii. 16.

also in מַה־הִיא *what it is*, Ps. xxxix. 5; מַה חַטָּאתִי *what* (is) *my in?* Gen. xxxi. 36.

4th, Whenever any letter capable of receiving *Dāgésh* follows, מַה is with *Pāthákh*, and *Dāgésh* is expressed in the following letter: as, מַה־טּוֹב וּמַה־נָּעִים *how good, and how pleasant?* In מַה־שְּׁתֵּי *what two* (fem.)? Zech. iv. 12, the *Dāgésh* is omitted.

5th, When any guttural letter, having (ר), or ח or ע not having it, immediately follows, we have מֶה with *Sēgól*, apparently for the sake of euphony: as, מֶה־הָיָה לוֹ *what has happened to him?* Exod. xxxii. 1; מֶה־חָדֵל *what defect?* Ps. xxxix. 5; מֶה עָשִׂיתִי *what have I done?* &c.

On the Interrogative and Inseparable Particle ה.

192. The Interrogative particle הַ, הֶ or הֶ, has by some been classed with the definite article; but, if we consider either its construction, or office, we must be convinced that they are totally different words.

2d, The office of this particle is interrogation, like the Latin *an, annon, num, utrum?* or the like; and, in this capacity, to *affirm* or *deny;* and thus to *increase* or *diminish* the importance of subjects with which it is connected.

3d, It is always prefixed to some word, and is often followed, in the succeeding member of a sentence, by the particle אִם, having nearly the same signification with *utrum* and *an*, in Latin, when corresponding to each other in different members of a sentence; or, as *an* and *vel*, in the following passage, הַאַתָּה זֶה בְּנִי עֵשָׂו אִם־לֹא "AN *tu es, fili mi Esave,* VEL" *non,* Gen. xxvii. 21.*

---

* These particles correspond, both in sense and construction, with the Arabic أَ and أَم, as in the following passage from the Koran, c. 1. v. 5. أأنذرتهم أم لم تنذرهم WHETHER *thou admonish them,* OR *whether thou do not admonish them.*

4th, In many instances it loses its interrogative power, as it often happens with similar particles in other languages, and then may be construed as a relative, or otherwise; as, הֲהָלְכוּא אִתּוֹ *who came with him,** Josh. x. 24; הֲיִשְׁכֶּם *whether you are,* Deut. xiii. 4; הֲפָרְחָה *whether it blossoms,* Cant. vi. 11, &c.

5th, When prefixed to any word commencing with *Sheva* (:) or (ֲ) it takes the vowel (ַ) with the Euphonic accent; and, therefore, does not require, that the following letter should take *Dāgésh forte:* as, הַשְׁכַחְתֶּם *have ye forgotten?* Jer. xliv. 9; הֲבֻרָכָה *num benedictio?* Gen. xxvii. 38; הֲלְמַעַנְךָ *whether on thy account?* Job xviii. 4, &c. With gutturals; הֲאֱמֶת *whether truth?* הַעֵת *whether time?*

6th, In these cases, however, the *Dāgésh* is often found written: as, הַדְּרָכַי *whether my ways?* Ezek. xviii. 29; הַרְאִיתֶם *have ye seen?* 1 Sam. x. 24; הַכְּצַעֲקָתָהּ *whether according to her cry?* Gen. xviii. 21. And once, when *Sheva* is not attached to the first letter of such word: as, הֵיִיטַב *will it be well,* Lev. x. 19.

7th, When any word, to which this particle is prefixed, commences with a consonant and a vowel (excepting gutturals with ר), the interrogative will take (ֲ): as, הֲמִן־הָעֵץ *whether of the tree?* Gen. iii. 11; הֲצֹאן *shall the flock . . . ?* Num. xi. 22; הֲיִקָּרֶה *shall it happen to thee?*

8th, Guttural letters having (ר) require the Interrogative particle to be prefixed with (ֲ): as, הֲאָנֹכִי *whether I?* Num. xi. 12; הֲחָיְתָה *has it come to pass?* Joel i. 2; הֲחָזָק *whether strong?* We also have, הֲחָדַלְתִּי *shall I cease?* Judg. ix. 9, &c., which is perhaps erroneous, for הֲחָדַלְתִּי. We also have, הֲאַתֶּם *whether you?* Judg. vi. 31; and, הֲאֶפְרָתִי *whether an Ephrathite?* Ib. xii. 5, which are anomalous.

9th, Noldius is of opinion, that this particle is a mere interjection forced out by the breath with some effort, in order to give the passage the force of an interrogation, or otherwise to heighten the expression, which is extremely probable. The passages too, which require to be construed interrogatively, but in which this particle is not found, must be

---

* In which case it differs but very little from the definite article when equivalent to אֲשֶׁר. So, المعة in Arabic, for معة الَّذِي Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 338.

so enounced, otherwise their interrogative signification will not be perceived; e. g. In 2 Sam. xviii. 29, we have שָׁלוֹם for הֲשָׁלוֹם, which is found Ib. 32. and also in the similar passages, 2 Kings ix. 18, 19. In like manner perhaps אֶשָּׂא for הַאֶשָּׂא *shall I lift up*, Ps. cxxi. 1; and עָשִׂיתִי for הֶעָשִׂיתִי Ezek. xvi. 59, which, when expressed with emphasis, would have the same effect as they would had the particle been prefixed. Indeed, this is very much the case in all languages. But, in those of the East, where no note of interrogation is used, we are compelled to determine by the context, whether a sentence is to be taken interrogatively or not; and, hence, whether it is to be understood in a positive or negative sense. When this particle is prefixed, however, the ambiguity is in a great measure removed; but, unfortunately, this is not always the case.

10th, The Interrogative particle אִי, which is sometimes written separately, and at others, is prefixed to pronouns, is probably nothing more than an interjection, like the preceding, so enounced as to imply an interrogation. It is sometimes found of the forms הֵא and הָא, and in conjunction with a pronoun: as, הֵיךְ and אֵיךְ.* Examples: אִי הֶבֶל אָחִיךָ *where is Abel thy brother?* Gen. iv. 9; אִי לָזֹאת אֶסְלַח־לָךְ *how can I pardon thee for this?* Jer. v. 7. With pronouns; אֵי־זֶה *where*, Est. vii. 5, 1 Sam. ix. 18, Is. l. 1; אֵי־זֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ הָלַךְ *which way went he?* 1 Kings xiii. 12; אֵי־מִזֶּה עִיר אַתָּה *from what city* (art) *thou?* 2 Sam. xv. 2; אֵיךְ יָדַעְתָּ *how knowest thou?* 2 Sam. i. 5; אֵיכָה נֵדַע *how can we know?* Deut. xviii. 21, &c.

11th, It also occurs with a paragogic ה, אַיֵּה: as, אַיֵּה הָאֲנָשִׁים *where* (are) *the men?* Gen. xix. 5.

12th, This particle is sometimes expressive of desire, admiration,

---

* In Persian, Sanscrit, and some other Oriental languages ای is an interjection O, Oh, &c. In Arabic أَيِّ has the same meaning as in Hebrew, viz. *Quisnam, quis, quod*, &c.

lamenting, expostulating, insulting, or negation, as it is also the case with most of the interrogative pronouns: as, אַיֵּה יְהוָה *where is Jehovah!* Jer. ii. 8. (desire) אַיֵּה אֵפוֹ תִקְוָתִי *where is now my hope!* Job xvii. 15. Of admiration; אֵיךְ אָבַדְתְּ *how hast thou perished!* Ezek. xxvi. 17, &c.

On the Definite Article ה.

193. The Hebrews have a fragment of a word which they prefix to others for the purpose of restricting, or otherwise modifying, their signification, as will presently be seen.

2d, Some have supposed this particle, which is nothing more than the letter ה with some accompanying vowel, to be an abbreviation of the pronoun הוּא *he*, or, of one or other of the interjections הֵן, הָא, הֵא *behold*. Others, again, have affirmed, that it is only another form of the Arabic article ال, אל, which should be written חַל.* In this case, as in many others, each party is, perhaps, both right and wrong. That both these articles have a common origin is extremely probable; and, that their force is the same in both languages, there can be no doubt. But, perhaps there is no good reason, why we are to derive the Hebrew form of the article from the Arabic one, any more than, that we should derive the Arabic one from the Hebrew. Professor Gesenius thinks, that there are still manifest traces of the Arabic article to be found in the Hebrew Bible, such, for instance, as, אַלְקוֹם Prov. xxx. 31, which he considers as equal to the Arabic القوم *the people;* אַלְמוֹדָד Gen. x. 26, and אֶלְתּוֹלַד Josh. xv. 30, which, 1 Chron. iv. 29, is written תּוֹלָד. With respect to the first of these, there seems to be but little necessity for supposing the syllable אַל to be the Arabic article ال. The interpretation of Schultens, Hiller, and others, who suppose (אַל) to be the prohibitive particle here, appears to me to answer the intention of the Sacred Writer much better. With respect to the proper names אַלְמוֹדָד, and אֶלְתּוֹלַד, the particle אַל or אֶל is sufficiently applicable, without having recourse to the Arabic

* Storr. Observ., &c. p. 121.

article. The circumstance of אֶל being omitted in one place, in the parallel passage, is nothing more than what is found to happen in other words and phrases, and particularly in proper names, (See Art. 178. 9, &c.).

3d, Another particular dwelt upon is, that in Hebrew, the letter following the article is almost always doubled; and, that in Arabic, the ل of the article is so assimilated to the following letter, in many cases, that the first letter of the word may be said to be doubled: as, הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ in Hebrew, and الشمس pronounced אַשֶّمْسُ in Arabic, both signifying *the sun*. It might be suggested: In Hebrew the imperfect vowel (-), with which this article is usually attended, makes it necessary, that the following letter be doubled, in order to complete the syllable commencing with the article, (Art. 34.). In Arabic, the ل of the article must either be pronounced or not. In many instances it is pronounced: it is only in others, that the sound of ل is merged in that of the succeeding letter: to which no parallel is to be found in Hebrew. I am of opinion, therefore, that the Arabs have introduced the ل of the article, and not, that the Hebrews have rejected it.*

4th, The article is regularly prefixed with *Páthakh* (-), occasionally with *Kāméts* (ָ) or *Sēgól* (ֶ): as, הַגָּדוֹל *the great*; הָאָדָם *the man*, or הֶעָרִים *the cities*.

5th, Whenever any letter capable of receiving *Dāgésh* follows the article, it will be doubled by that mark, and the article will take *Páthakh*; הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *the sun*.

6th, But, יְ, לְ, מְ, or צְ, (with *Shĕvá*) are frequently found so situated without *Dāgésh*: as, הַיְשׁוּעָה *the salvation*, Ps. iii. 9; הַיְאֹר *the river*, Exod. vii. 18, &c.

7th, Of words commencing with לְ, הַלְוִיִּם *the Levites*, Num. iii. 12. —With מְ, הַמְלַמֵּד *the teacher*, Ps. cxliv. 1; הַמְבַשְּׂרוֹת *the pro-*

---

* In the Commentary on the *Kāfia* by Moolla Jámi, published at Calcutta in 1818, it is cited as the opinion of El Mobarrad, that א is the original form of the article, and that the ل has been added, in order to distinguish it from the interrogative א, ا, p. ١٢. The words are, والمبرّد ذهب الي انّها الهمزة المفتوحة وحدها زيدت اللام للفرق بينها وبين همزة الاستفهام.

claimers (fem.) *of good news*, Ps. lxviii. 12.—Yet we have הַמְּשֻׁגָּע *the insane*, 2 Kings ix. 11; הַמְּעֻנָּגָה *the delicate woman*, Jer. vi. 2; הַמְּנָאֶפֶת *the adulteress*, Ezek. xvi. 32, and הַמְּבַשְּׁלִים *the cooks*, Ib. xlvi. 24, &c.—With צ: as, הַצְּפַרְדְּעִים *the frogs*, Exod. vii. 29. Yet we have הַצְּפַרְדֵּעַ *the frog*, Exod. viii. 2. In most of these instances, it is probable, the negligence of the transcribers has been the sole cause of the omissions.

8th, If, however, either of the letters ה, ח, or ע, follows, *Dāgésh* is mostly expressed: as, הַיְּהוּדִים *the Jews*, &c.

9th, But, when any letter incapable of receiving *Dāgésh* follows the article, it will take the perfect vowel corresponding to (-) in order to complete its syllable: as, הָאִישׁ *the man*; הָרֹאשׁ *the head*; הָעַלְמָה *the virgin*, &c.

10th, In many instances, however, when ה or ח follows, (-) is still retained: as, הַחֹלֶדֶת *that which proceedeth*, Gen. ii. 14; הַחַיָּה *the living creature*, Gen. viii. 1. In all which cases (-) will either be sustained by an accent, or must be considered as placing an occult *Dāgésh* in the following letter (Art. 115.).

11th, In words, not monosyllables, commencing with ה, ח, or ע, having *Kāméts* (ָ), the article usually takes (ֲ): as, הֶחָכָם *the wise man*; הֶעָרִים *the cities* (Art. 93. 6.).

12th, When such words are monosyllables the former rule prevails: as, הָהָר *the mountain*; הָעָם *the people*, No. 9.

13th, The letter ח, however, having (ַ) or (ַּ) in monosyllables, will mostly prefix the article with (ֲ): as, הָחָי 1 Kings iii. 22. 23 (where it also occurs, הַחַי); הֶחֳרָבוֹת *the wastes*, Ezek. xxxvi. 35. The word אֶרֶץ *earth*, always takes (ַ) with the article, and changes its first (ֲ) to (ָ) for the sake of euphony: as, הָאָרֶץ *the earth*.

14th, On the use of the article we shall speak particularly when we come to the Syntax. It will suffice for the present to remark, that its offices appear to be two: one, to mark the noun to which it is prefixed, as being already known, either from the context, or from general consent: as, הָאוֹר *the light*, Gen. i. 4; or, הַשָּׁמַיִם *the heavens*, Ib. i. 1; הָעַלְמָה * ἡ παρθένος,

* The Jews and some of the German Divines have thought, that in this,

Is. vii. 14, &c.: the other, for the purpose of impressing upon the mind of the Hearer or Reader, the *peculiar property, nature, character,* &c. of the noun to which it is prefixed: as, הָאֲרִי *an animal* remarkable for its properties as a *lion,* 1 Sam. xvii. 34. So Ib. הַדֹּב *a very bear.* So, passim הָאֱלֹהִים *the real* or *true God.* In this sense it is occasionally used as a vocative: as, הַבַּעַל, Being designated as *Lord Possessor,* or the like, 1 Kings xviii. 26. So, in the N. Test. ὁ θεὸς, Heb. i. 8. Apoc. xv. 3, &c.

15th, This particle is also said to occur in the sense of the Latin *versus,* when found prefixed or postfixed, or both, to words: as, הָרָמָתָה *towards Ramah,* 1 Sam. vii. 17; הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים *to,* or *towards, the Philistines,* Ib. xiii. 20; הָעִיר *to the city,* Ib. xx. 40. 42; הָאֹהֱלָה שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ *to the tent of Sarah his mother,** Gen. xxiv. 67. To which many others might be added. In these instances, however, it is very doubtful, whether the article does not retain its original signification, the noun following being considered as complementary to some preceding verb: as, Josh. viii. 19, וַיָּבֹאוּ הָעִיר *and they entered* THE *city,* &c., or, by the preposition אֶל being understood. The following examples will tend to confirm this opinion, in which, according to Buxtorf,† the preposition is to be supplied; וַיָּבוֹא יְרוּשָׁלַם *and he came to Jerusalem,* 1 Kings iii. 15; אָבוֹא בֵיתֶךָ *I will enter thy house,* Ps. v. 8; וַיַּעַל הַמֶּלֶךְ בֵּית יְהוָה *and the king went up to the house of Jehovah,* 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30; וַיְבִיאֵם בָּבֶל *and he* (caused them to enter) *brought them to Babylon,* Jer. xxviii. 3.

16th, The passages in which ה occurs postfixed to words, and in which it is said to have the signification of *versus,* are numerous; yet,

---

and some other cases, the article is equivalent to the Demonstrative pronoun *this,* than which nothing can be more unfounded.

* This sentence is elliptical, for הָאֹהֱלָה אֹהֶל שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ See Gen. xxvii. 22, &c. חַקֹּל קֹל יַעֲקֹב.

† Thesaurus Grammaticus, lib. ii. cap. xii. Reg. v. See also Hilleri. Onom. p. 339.

it must not be dissembled, that passages which must be so construed, but in which this particle is not found, are also numerous. Noldius is of opinion, that it is nothing more than a paragogic letter, added for the mere sake of Euphony; or, with the view of giving some emphasis: and, if this latter be the case, it will be the definite article, as used in the Chaldaic and Syriac.* Buxtorf holds, that it is not paragogic, because, says he, "tales literæ nihil ad vocem consignificant."†

17th, When this particle is postfixed, it does not take the accent, in which particular it differs from the feminine affix ה. The following are a few examples of its occurrence: מִצְרַיְמָה *to Egypt*, Gen. xii. 10. 14, &c.; הַשָּׁמַיְמָה *towards heaven*, Gen. xv. 5, xxviii. 11, &c.; הַיְאֹרָה *into the river*, Exod. i. 22; הַמִּדְבָּרָה *towards the desert*, Exod. iv. 27, &c. In these cases, it is said by some to be equivalent to the Syriac and Chaldaic א, which either makes the noun definite to which it is attached, or gives some emphasis to the sentence.

On the Numerals.

194. The last species of nouns, of which we have to treat, are the numerals: these are of two kinds: 1st, those which designate the *number* of persons or things to be thus defined, and are termed the *Cardinal Numbers;* and, 2d, those which determine the *order* in which they are to be taken: as, *first, second,* &c., which are termed the *Ordinal Numbers.*

2d, The *Cardinal Numbers* are designated in Hebrew by substantives put either in apposition, or in the state of construction, with the persons or things to be numbered: and they have this peculiarity, that those which designate

---

* ת paragogicum nil nisi pronunciantis nisus est, qui vel impetum et tendentiam ad locum objectumve aliud; vel admirationem magnitudinis, aut, in negativis, exiguitatis rei significat; vel ob soni saltem suavitatem vocibus adjicitur." Concord. part. Ed. 1734. p. 217, note.

† Thesaur. Gram. p. 568.

the numbers from three to ten inclusively, take the feminine form with masculine nouns; and, *vice versa*, the masculine form with feminine nouns. But of this more will be said in the Syntax. The decimal numbers may be considered as adjectives or epithets.

Table of both the Cardinal and Ordinal Numbers.

CARDINAL NUMBERS.

	Masc.	Fem.
One, abs.	אֶחָד	אַחַת
In construction	אַחַד	*id.*
Two,	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁתַּיִם
const.	שְׁנֵי	שְׁתֵּי
Three,	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשֶׁת
const.	שְׁלֹשׁ	שְׁלֹשֶׁת
Four,	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבַּע
const.	*id.*	אַרְבַּעַת
Five,	חֲמִשָּׁה	חָמֵשׁ
const.	חֲמִשֶּׁת	חֲמֵשׁ
Six,	שִׁשָּׁה	שֵׁשׁ
const.	שִׁשֶּׁת	*id.*
Seven,	שִׁבְעָה	שֶׁבַע
const.	שִׁבְעַת	שִׁבְעָ
Eight,	שְׁמֹנָה	שְׁמֹנֶה
const.	שְׁמֹנַת	*id.*
Nine,	תִּשְׁעָה	תֵּשַׁע
const.	תִּשְׁעַת	תִּשְׁעָ
Ten,	עֲשָׂרָה	עֶשֶׂר
const.	עֲשֶׂרֶת	*id.*

	Masc.	
Twenty,	עֶשְׂרִים	com. gen.
Thirty,	שְׁלֹשִׁים	
Forty,	אַרְבָּעִים	
Fifty,	חֲמִשִּׁים	
Sixty,	שִׁשִּׁים	
Seventy,	שִׁבְעִים	
Eighty,	שְׁמֹנִים	
Ninety,	תִּשְׁעִים	
A hundred,	מֵאָה	
constr.	מְאַת	
Two hundred,	מָאתַיִם	for מְאָתַיִם
A thousand,	אֶלֶף	
Two thousand,	אַלְפַּיִם	
Ten thousand,	רִבּוֹ, רִבּוֹא or רִבָּבָה	
	רִבְבָה or רִבְאָה	

Ordinal Numbers.

	Masc.	Fem.
First,	רִאשׁוֹן or אֶחָד	רִאשׁוֹנָה
Second,	שֵׁנִי	שֵׁנִית
Third,	שְׁלִישִׁי	שְׁלִישִׁית
Fourth,	רְבִיעִי	רְבִיעִית
Fifth,	חֲמִישִׁי	חֲמִישִׁית
Sixth,	שִׁשִּׁי	שִׁשִּׁית
Seventh,	שְׁבִיעִי	שְׁבִיעִית
Eighth,	שְׁמִינִי	שְׁמִינִית
Ninth,	תְּשִׁיעִי	תְּשִׁיעִית
Tenth,	עֲשִׂירִי	עֲשִׂירִית

3d, The rest of the Ordinal Numbers are made by the terms appropriated to the Cardinal ones: as, חֲמִשָּׁה עָשְׂרֵה *the eleventh year;* so, שִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר יוֹם *the seventeenth day.*

4th, In some other cases also the Cardinal Number has been preferred: as, יוֹם אֶחָד *the first day*; שְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם *the second year*; so, שְׁנַת שֶׁבַע *the seventh year*. But these are elliptical expressions, see Lev. xxv. 10, 11. שְׁנַת חֲמִשִּׁים שָׁנָה *the year of fifty years*, i. e. *the fiftieth*. And Gen. vii. 11, בִּשְׁנַת שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה *in the year of six hundred years*, i. e. *in the six hundredth year*, Gen. vii. 11.

5th, The decimal numerals ending in ־ִים: as, עֶשְׂרִים are never found taking the form for construction, עֶשְׂרֵי, &c. (Art. 151. 7.).

6th, When the feminine form occurs in these numerals, distribution, or parcels consisting each of that number of persons or things, is intended to be conveyed: as, וְשָׂרֵי עֲשָׂרוֹת *and chiefs of the tens*, Exod. xviii. 25.

7th, The intermediate numbers from ten to twenty, twenty to thirty, &c. are made by connecting a decimal with an unit, in the following manner.

	Masc.	Fem.
Eleven,	אַחַד עָשָׂר	אַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה
	or עַשְׁתֵּי עָשָׂר	עַשְׁתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵה
Twelve,	שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר	שְׁתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵה
	or שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר	שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה
Thirteen,	שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר	שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה
Fourteen,	אַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר	אַרְבַּע עֶשְׂרֵה
Fifteen,	חֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר	חָמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה
Sixteen,	שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר	שֵׁשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה
Seventeen,	שִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר	שְׁבַע עֶשְׂרֵה
Eighteen,	שְׁמֹנָה עָשָׂר	שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה
Nineteen,	תִּשְׁעָה עָשָׂר	תִּשַׁע עֶשְׂרֵה

8th, Some passages occur in which אַחַד is found as the absolute form: as, לְאַחַד מֵהֶם *to one of them*, Deut. xxviii. 55. So 2 Kings ix. 1, Ezek. xlvi. 17, Zech. xi. 7, &c.

9th, In two instances this word is found defectively written, Ezek. xviii. 10, אָח; and Ib. xxxiii. 30, חַד.

10th, The feminine form אחת, when found at the end of a sentence

with the accent *Athnákh*, or *Sēgól*, is written אֶחָת. See Exod. xxxvi. 10 where it occurs twice.

11th, This word (אחד) is also found in the plural: as, דְּבָרִים אֲחָדִים *dictiones unæ*, like *mœniis, unis* in Latin, Gen. xi. 1, it. Ib. xxvii. 44, xxix. 20, Ezek. xxxvii. 17, Dan. xi. 20; שְׁתַּיִם is put for שְׁנָתַיִם, the נ being dropped, and its loss supplied by *Dāgésh* (not *forté*) (Art. 82.).

12th, From twenty to thirty, &c.

	Com.	Masc.	Fem.*
One-and-twenty,	וְעֶשְׂרִים	אַחַד or	אַחַת
Two-and-twenty,	וְעֶשְׂרִים	שְׁנַיִם —	שְׁתַּיִם
Three-and-thirty,	וּשְׁלֹשִׁים	שְׁלֹשָׁה —	שָׁלֹשׁ
Four-and-forty,	וְאַרְבָּעִים	אַרְבָּעָה —	אַרְבַּע
Fifty-five,	וַחֲמִשִּׁים	חֲמִשָּׁה —	חָמֵשׁ
Sixty-six,	וְשִׁשִּׁים	שִׁשָּׁה —	שֵׁשׁ
Seventy-seven,	וְשִׁבְעִים	שִׁבְעָה —	שֶׁבַע
Eighty-eight,	וּשְׁמֹנִים	שְׁמֹנָה —	שְׁמֹנֶה
Ninety-nine,	וְתִשְׁעִים	תִּשְׁעָה —	תֵּשַׁע

	Com. gen.
Three hundred,	שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת
Four ditto,	אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת
Five ditto,	חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת
Three thousand,	שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים
Four ditto,	אַרְבָּעָה אֲלָפִים
Five ditto,	חֲמֵשֶׁת אֲלָפִים
Twice ten thousand,	שְׁתֵּי רִבּוֹת
Twenty thousand,	עֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף
Ten times ten thousand,	עֶשֶׂר רִבּוֹת
A hundred thousand,	מֵאָה or מְאַת אֶלֶף
Six hundred thousand,	שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף

* See No. 2. above.

13th, The Cardinal Numerals, from three to ten inclusive, require the word designating the thing numbered to be put in the plural number: all the others require the singular. Examples, חֲמֵשׁ שָׁנִים וּמְאַת שָׁנָה *five years and a hundred year*, Gen. v. 6; שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה *seven years and eight hundred year*, Ib. 7.

There are, however, some instances in which this rule is not observed: as, עֶשְׂרִים קְרָשִׁים *twenty tables*, Exod. xxxvi. 23; חֲמִשִּׁים שְׁקָלִים *fifty shekels*, Josh. vii. 21; עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף *twenty and four thousand*, 1 Chron. xxvii. 1; בֶּן־עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ שָׁנָה *a son of twenty and five years*, i. e. a man five and twenty years old. So עֶשְׂרִים וָתֵשַׁע שָׁנָה *twenty and nine years*, 2 Kings xiv. 2. But of this more will be said in the Syntax.

14th, When the decimal number takes the precedence, the conjunction ו is used: as, שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה *seventy and seven*; תִּשְׁעִים וְשִׁשָּׁה *ninety and six*, Ezr. viii. 35, &c.

15th, When the numerals are to be used distributively, they are repeated like other nouns: as, שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם *two and two*, i. e. *by twos*; חֲמִשִּׁים חֲמִשִּׁים אִישׁ *by fifties*, or *every fiftieth man*.

16th, Numerals signifying the repetition of any quantity or thing, are generally expressed by the dual number: as, אַרְבַּעְתַּיִם *four-fold*; שִׁבְעָתַיִם *seven-fold*, or, *seven times repeated*.

LECTURE X.

ON THE HEBREW VERBS.

195. We now come to treat on the theory of the Hebrew Verbs, and to shew, first, In what way they appear to have been formed; and secondly, To delineate and explain their several conjugations.

2d, The verb, we believe (See Art. 152.), is, in its crude state, nothing more than a noun of one form or other;* and, that its signification will be regulated by that peculiar to the form of the noun to which it belongs, whether that form be primitive or derived.

3d, If, therefore, we have the means of knowing what signification is to be attached to the different forms of the primitive nouns, as also how the augmented forms are

---

* Kimchi says in the Mikhlol. fol. 3. verso. ואכתוב שער דקדוק הפעלים בתחלה ואף על פי שהשם קודם לפעל כי הפעל יצא מהשם ואמרו כי השם כמו הגוף נושא המקרים והפעל כמו מקרה "I first proceed to write the chapter on the Grammar of verbs, although the noun precedes the verb: for the verb proceeds from the noun. And they say, that the noun is, as the body, the subject of accident; but, that the verb (may be considered) as the accident (only)." And again, fol. קצא verso. כי .... דע השמות הם שנים חלקים יש מהם שם שהוא נגזר מן הפועל או הפועל ממנו כמו רְאוּבֵן, שִׁמְעוֹן, זְבוּלֻן שהוא שם נגזר מן הפועל, חָכָם, רָשָׁע צַדִּיק, חֶרֶב, שֶׁלֶג והדומים להם נגזר הפועל מן השם i.e. "Observe that nouns are of two sorts. There are those which are either derived from verbs, or, from which verbs are derived: as, *Reuben, Simeon, Zebulon*, each of which is derived from a verb; חָכָם *wise;* רָשָׁע *wicked;* צַדִּיק *just;* חֶרֶב *a sword;* שֶׁלֶג *snow*, and the like, are nouns from which verbs are derived" (Art. 152. 2, note).

derived, and the sense they will bear, we shall also know, to what class the verb itself is to be referred, and what must be its general force and meaning.

4th, In our Lectures on the forms and derivation of nouns we endeavoured to lay before the Student all that appeared necessary on that subject, leaving it to his own industry to follow out the enquiry to any extent he may think proper. We now come to shew how this bears on the question before us.

5th, The different forms of the verb, as found generally in the conjugations, amount to seven; four of these have an active, and three a passive (and sometimes a reciprocal) signification.

6th, The first of these has been termed *Kal,* קַל i. e. *levis, light*; because the root is here exhibited in its simple state. Verbs of this species may be either active or neuter.

7th, In this conjugation, or *species,* as we shall term it, three forms are in use, which may be represented by the measures פָּקַד, פָּקֵד, and פָּקֹד, corresponding to the forms of nouns given in Artt. 161. Ff. II. III. X.*

8th, Again, in this, as in every other species of the conjugations of Hebrew verbs, two tenses only are found: namely, the *Past,* and the *Present.*

9th, The leading word in every species will designate the third person singular of the masculine gender of the

---

* The same distinction of vowels proper for the medial radical letter of the root exists in the Arabic, where, as in the Hebrew, the first generally denotes transitive verbs: as, نَصَرَ *he assisted:* the second, verbs of sense: as, سَمِعَ *he heard;* فَرِحَ *he was glad:* the third, imply habit; as, كَرُمَ *he was generous,* &c. So פָּקַד *he visited;* שָׂמַח *he was glad;* יָכֹל *he was powerful.*

Preterite Tense; and, in *Kal*, this will always be the primitive noun of the form פָּקֹד, פָּקֵד, or פָּקְד.

10th, The leading word proper for the present tense of this species is always a noun of one or other of the primitive Segolate forms: as, פִּקֹּד, פִּקֵּד, or פִּקֶּד (See Art. 156, &c.), which, when combined with one or other of the pronouns, will present both the vowels, and signification, proper for this species of the conjugation.

196. The next species, taken in the usual order, is termed *Niphhál*, נִפְעַל, because, as it should seem, that word presents the conjugation itself of the *word* formerly taken as a paradigm for the verbs in general, which was פָּעַל. This we shall arrange as being *the passive* of the foregoing, although strictly speaking, it is not always so.

2d, This species, according to our system, is an augmented word, combined of two others, giving both the form and sense peculiar to this conjugation (See Art. 165. 18, 19, &c. 170. Ff. I. II.) נִפְקַד, therefore, will be the measure generally taken for the leading person of the Preterite tense of this species: as, נִפְקַד *he was,* or *became, visited.*

3d, The Present tense of this species is formed on the measure נִפְקָד (for הִנִּפְקָד Art. 165. 18. 170, &c.); which, with the abbreviated form of the pronoun of the third person sing. masc. will become יִפָּקֵד *he was visited,* and, by Art. 82. יִפָּקֵד.

4th, The third species has been termed *Pīhél* פִּעֵל. This is always of the active voice; and, for the most part, it has a transitive signification (See Art. 162. 7, &c.). The measure proper for the leading person of the Preterite is פִּקֵּד, which is one of the augmented and intensitive forms given under Art. 162. 4, &c.

5th, The form proper for the leading person of the present tense is of the cognate form, Ib. Form I. פִּקֵּד,

which, with the abridged form of the pronoun, will become וְפִקֵּד.

6th, The passive species peculiar to this class of verbs is termed *Pūḥál* פֻּעַל. Its leading word will be of the measure פֻּקַּד, and will always be a noun of the form given in Art. 162. Form V. This may be termed the fourth *Species*.

7th, The fifth species is termed *Hiphḥíl* הִפְעִיל, the leading word of which is cognate with those of the augmented nouns given Art. 168: that proper for the Preterite being of the measure הִפְקִיד,—for the Present, מַפְקִיד, for the signification of which see Art. 165. 2—9.

8th, The sixth, and which is passive of *Hiphḥíl*, is termed *Hophḥál* הָפְעַל. This takes for the leading word of both tenses, a word of the augmented form הָפְקַד. See Artt. 165. 10. 168. F. VII. having a passive signification.

9th, The seventh and last species is called *Hithpāḥél*, הִתְפַּעֵל, which, as before, is the form taken in the old paradigm פָּעַל in this species. Our form is הִתְפַּקֵּד. The leading words proper for the roots of both tenses, will always be of this measure, affording the sense proper for nouns of this form, See Artt. 165. 12—15. 172. Ff. I. II.

197. These are the forms of the several Species of the Conjugation of Hebrew verbs, as usually given in the Grammars. But, to these, a few others are added: which, as they occur less frequently, have been considered as anomalous. They are, however, according to our view of the subject, just as regular in their formation as those already mentioned: and, although they occur less frequently, which might easily be accounted for, they are quite as consistent with the analogy of the language, as any verbs can possibly be.

2d, These additional species are thought to be analogous to the *Pīḥél*, *Pūḥál*, and *Hithpāḥél*, species; because some reduplication of the letters or syllables of the root is generally found to take place, in these, as it does in those, forms; and consequently affording similar

significations; although the same letters are not always doubled, nor the same vowels found to accompany them.

3d, It has been remarked (Art. 162. 5.), that the nouns of excess formed from roots having ו or י for the middle radical letter; or, which have the same letter in the second and third of the root, usually take the forms פּוֹעֵל, for the active, and פּוֹעָל, for the passive signification: as, קוֹמֵם, בּוֹנֵן, סוֹבֵב, for the active; and, קוֹמָם, בּוֹנָן, סוֹבָב, for the passive of these words, respectively.

4th, Instead of פָּעַל, and פָּעָל, therefore, which is the measure proper for the species termed *Pīhél* and *Pūhál*, we shall always have these forms from roots of this description: the same word being taken as the ground form for each tense respectively; קוֹמֵם, וְקוֹמֵם, וְקוֹמָם, &c.

5th, The same form is taken for the *Hithpāhél* species, i. e. instead of הִתְפַּעֵל, we shall have הִתְפּוֹעֵל for the measure: as, הִתְקוֹמֵם, הִתְבּוֹנֵן; and so of others.

198. There is, moreover, a great number of forms peculiar to certain species of the conjugation, as laid down by Schultens and Schrœder, and, before them, by David Kimchi, and other Grammarians; of these some notice should be taken. These writers, then, have considered these species as having sometime existed: and, hence, they have proceeded to derive nouns of similar forms from them, even when the form itself has not occurred as a verb; all of which seems to me to be proceeding in an inverted order. According to our system, the addition of one or other of the pronouns to any noun, simple or augmented, will always have the effect of investing it with the powers of a verb: and hence it probably is, that we occasionally find this done both in the Hebrew and all its dialects. This will perhaps account for these rare augmented forms: as also, for the instances, in which nouns, which were originally the mere names of substances, are found acting as verbs in these tongues.

2d, But, to come to these remaining and rarer forms, which are sometimes found as verbs: 1st, הִתְפַּעֵל, the passive form of הִתְפַּעֵל, just as הָפְעַל or הָפְעָל, is of הִפְעִיל. Of this form we have הִטַּמֵּא (for הִתְטַמֵּא Art. 89. 2.) *rendered impure*, or *polluted;* prim. noun, טָמֵא. So הִדַּשְּׁנָה *made fat*, for הִתְדַּשְּׁנָה Is. xxxiv. 6, where, however, the *Dāgésh* proper for the שׁ is omitted.

3d, II. This form is given by Schrœder פָּאֲעַל, from which we have

only a noun supposed to be derived from this species of the verb, viz. בְּגוֹדָה *perfidious*, Jer. iii. 7. 10. This, therefore, does not occur as a species of the Conjugation: it is also doubtful, whether it is to be referred to the form given by this excellent Grammarian. Surely, as the (ד) is immutable, פָּאקוֹד would be the more suitable measure.

4th, III. הִתְפָּאקֵד. Of this form is יִתְפָּקְדוּ, and הִתְפָּקְדוּ, occurring Judg. xx. 15. 17. But here we have no necessity for introducing a new form; the omission of *Dāgésh* in the ק, which might have been merely accidental, would make it necessary that the preceding vowel should be a perfect one, (Art. 34.). This form, therefore, may be considered as belonging to *Hithpāḥél*, which has already been considered (Art. 196. 9.).

5th, The next form given by Schrœder is הָתְפָּאקַד, or הָתְפָּקַד, which may be referred to the first of these forms (No. 2.), with the additional consideration, that the *Dāgésh* proper for ק has been omitted, and supplied as in the last. The examples occur, Num. i. 47, 1 Kings xx. 27, &c.

6th, His two next forms, viz. פּוֹקַד and פּוֹקֵד having a reciprocal sense, are unsupported by the passages adduced. We may dismiss them, therefore, without farther enquiry.

7th, The next form, הִתְפּוֹקֵד, should have been הִתְפּוֹדֵד, his example being הִתְגּוֹלֵל, which is manifestly derived from the root גָּלַל. See Art. 197. 5.

8th, In the form פָּקֵד, as exemplified in אָהֵב, and הָחֵל, we have, I believe, nothing more than a form equivalent to פָּקָד, in which the *Dāgésh* being omitted, we have a perfect vowel supplied to compensate for the defect thus occasioned. See Art. 115.

9th, The next form given is פּוֹקַד, which Schrœder exemplifies by הוֹחַל Is. xliv. 20: but this does not occur as a verb.

10th, Of his next form פָּקְאַד, no example occurs; שְׂמְאֵל as given by him is fictitious. The noun is שְׂמֹאל *left hand*, &c.: which, when augmented, becomes הַשְׂמְאִיל, signifying to *proceed in that direction*. Whether Schrœder's derivation of it from שָׂמַל, be correct or not, may be matter for dispute.

11th, We next have פָּקְדַד, and the example given רַעֲנַן *green*, which is said to be put for רְעָנַן, or רְעֲנַן. But all this is extremely doubtful. The noun appears to be merely one of those augmented by the addition of ן (see Art. 176.); קוֹמֵם for קוֹמֵם as Schrœder has

put it, we think comes more properly under another form, which however, is nothing more than a noun.

12th, His next form פָּקְדֵד, has, for the same reason, no connection with קוֹמֵם. And the other example given is manifestly a noun, אֶמְלַל, referable to the compound form (Art. 177. 7.).

13th, The form הִתְפַּקְדֵד should rather have been הִתְפּוֹקֵד, in order to admit of the form הִתְקוֹמֵם. But, as we have already considered this form (Art. 197. 5.), we need not dwell any longer on it here.

14th, The form פִּקְדְקֵד, is that of a reduplicated noun (Art. 177.), which is often conjugated as a verb: as, סְחַרְחַר *travelling about as a merchant*, &c. of which examples will be given hereafter.

15th, With respect to the other forms, viz. שְׁפַקְד, תִּפְקֵד, מִפְקֵד, the first does not occur, and the rest have been given under the different forms of the noun, and accounted for; we need not, therefore, add any thing further on them now.*

199. The forms, therefore, proper for the leading words of all the species of conjugations now in use will be as follows:

---

* In the cognate dialects of the Hebrew, viz. the Arabic, Ethiopic, Syriac, and Chaldaic, we have a considerable number of forms seldom found in the common Grammars. In Erpenius's Arabic Grammar, we have only thirteen forms of the triliteral, and four of the quadriliteral, verb. In M. de Sacy's Grammar, we have two more noticed in the triliteral verbs, four under the quadriliterals, and a few others, which are said to belong to the triliterals, but which have been augmented by a letter or two. Scheidius gives upwards of forty forms in his "Primæ Lineæ Institutionum Arabicarum." Lugd. Batav. 1779. And Mr. Lumsden, in his elaborate Volume on Arabic Grammar, has given a list of still greater extent, amounting to fifty (Gram. p. 162, &c.), from which it appears, that it has often been a matter of difficulty with the native Grammarians to determine, whether many of these should be referred to triliteral or quadriliteral roots. Some of them do not occur more than once; and this should suggest, that the language itself acknowledges no such conjugations generally; but, on the contrary, that nouns of these forms have occasionally been made to occupy the situation of verbs.

Species.	Forms.	Species.		General Force.
1	פָּקַד active. פָּקֵד neuter. פָּקֹד *id.*	2	נִפְקַד passive or reciprocal.	Simple, or translated, sense of the root.
3	פִּקֵּד active, causal, &c. פּוֹדֵד *id.*	4	פֻּקַּד passive. פּוֹדַד *id.*	Transitive, when the root in Kal is not so. Sometimes intensitive, frequentative, or even causal. Names of substances often take this form when converted into verbs.
5	הִפְקִיד active, causal, &c.	6	הָפְקַד passive. or הֻפְקַד	Causative. Transitive. Also the form assumed by many substantives when used as verbs.
7	הִתְפַּקֵּד active, reciprocal, or &c. הִתְפּוֹדֵד *id.*	8	הָתְפַּקַּד passive. or הֻתְפַּקַּד *id.*	Reciprocal, Passive, Reflective occasionally.
Rare. 9	פְּקֵדֵד neuter.			Intensitive.
10	פְּקַדְקֵד or פֻּקַדְקַד neuter.			Frequentative, Intensitive, or the like.
11	*תְּפַקֵּד neuter.	—		Frequentative.
12	†מְפַקֵּד neuter.			Habit, or custom, perhaps it occurs, however, but seldom; and, therefore, little can be said as to its general sense.

---

* It is remarkable enough, that some cases occur in the Arabic, in which ت, ת, occurs, even when the verb has already been augmented by that letter: as, تَتَقَطَّعَتْ *she*, or *it*, *has cut*. The same excess occurs in the word تَشَابَهَتْ *she resembled*, in which the additional ت is implied in the (ـّـ) *teshdeed*, with the ش.

† In Arabic we also have verbs augmented by م, מ, as مَرْحَبَ and

2d, But, for particulars, as to their several significations, see Artt. 196. 197. &c., with the references.

3d, It must be borne in mind, that any change occurring in the forms of the nouns, with respect either to the vowels or consonants, will also occur when they are used as verbs: i. e. whenever any guttural letter occurs in the root, certain changes may take place, on that account, in the vowels: and that even the consonants אהוי, as well as the letters נ and ל, may disappear in certain cases: of these we shall give examples hereafter, when we come to detail the forms of the conjugations at length, when we shall also point out the rules on which these changes, &c. are founded.

200. It should be premised, that there are in the Hebrew, as in other languages, three persons, each of the singular and plural number:—that, in the verbs, there is no dual number; and, that the second and third persons, both singular and plural, have forms peculiar to both genders. The first person is, under one form, common to both genders; as in the pronouns (Art. 153. 2.).

2d, These distinctions, however, do not appear to arise out of the root itself, but out of the pronouns which are found either prefixed or postfixed to it in an abbreviated form.

مسهل, as in the phrases مرحبك الله ومسهلك "*May God make matters broad and easy for you.*" Lumsden's Arab. Gram. pp. 147. 154, in which there can be no doubt, that such words are nouns.

201. *Paradigm of the Preterite Tense of a Verb, conjugated with the Pronouns in the First Species, or* KAL.

First Form, פָּקַד *visiting.**

SINGULAR.

	Masc.		Fem.	
3	פָּקַד the primitive concrete noun.		פָּקְדָה	the same in the fem. gen. (Art. 143. 4.).
2	פָּקַדְתָּ for פָּקַד אַתָּה +		פָּקַדְתְּ	for פָּקַד אַתְּ
1	פָּקַדְתִּי — פָּקַד אָנִי		פָּקַדְתִּי	as before.

PLURAL.

3	פָּקְדוּ for פָּקַד הוּ or הֵוָה (Art. 147. 7.)	פָּקַדְנָה	as before.
2	פְּקַד אַתֶּם — פְּקַדְתֶּם	פְּקַדְתֶּן	for פְּקַד אַתֶּן
1	פָּקַד נַחְנוּ — פָּקַדְנוּ	פָּקַדְנוּ	as before.

---

* This, according to D. Kimchi, is the form taken by certain nouns: as, חָכָם *wise;* רָשָׁע *wicked;* סָכָל *intelligent,* &c. The only difference being that the noun ends in *Kāméts*, whereas the verb ends in *Páthakh*. But, he goes on to say, each equally ends in *Kāméts*, when at the end of a verse, or accompanied by certain accents: as, כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר *as he had said,* Gen. xxi. 1.; לֹא יָשָׁב *has not sat,* Ps. i. 1. There are also instances, pointed out by him, in which *Kāméts* is the terminating vowel, just as it is in the noun, when neither the position of the word, nor the accent requires any change in the vowels: as, 1 Sam. vii. 17, שָׁם שָׁפַט אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל *there he judged Israel.* To which he adds a number of similar examples. Mikhlol. fol. ה, verso. et fol. ו, in which we have *Kāméts* with the accent *Zākéf.*

† The pronouns of the second and first persons sing. and pl. have been abbreviated by Art. 79. The third sing. masc. and fem. is merely the noun. In the third pl. the ה is dropt also by Art. 79. The כ of the first pers. pl. is rejected by Art. 82.; and the guttural ה is omitted, perhaps for the sake of euphony.

2d, In the other forms, viz. פָּקֹד and פָּקֻד in this tense, the final vowel is considered as being mutable. The conjugation, therefore, will proceed thus:

Second Form, חָפֵץ *willing.**

	Singular.		Plural.	
Pers.	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
3	חָפֵץ	חָפְצָה	חָפְצוּ	חָפְצוּ
2	חָפַצְתָּ	חָפַצְתְּ	חֲפַצְתֶּם	חֲפַצְתֶּן
1	חָפַצְתִּי	חָפַצְתִּי	חָפַצְנוּ	חָפַצְנוּ

Third Form, יָכֹל *able.*†

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	יָכֹל	יָכְלָה	יָכְלוּ	יָכְלוּ
2	יָכֹלְתָּ	יָכֹלְתְּ	יְכֹלְתֶּם	יְכֹלְתֶּן
1	יָכֹלְתִּי	יָכֹלְתִּי	יָכֹלְנוּ	יָכֹלְנוּ

3d, It may be observed, in general, that the conjugation of the Preterite tense of every species, will be carried on just as in the instances here given; that is, by attaching the same abbreviations of the personal pro-

---

* Of this form are the following: חָמֵץ *fermenting,* זָקֵן *old,* יָבֵשׁ *dry,* שָׂנֵא *hating,* שָׂמֵחַ *rejoicing,* מָלֵא *filling,* אָפֵס *defective,* אָשֵׁם *guilty,* חָדֵל *ceasing,* חָנֵף *hypocritical,* חָסֵר *defective,* חָצֵב *cutting* wood, טָמֵא *impure,* בָּבֵל *withering,* שָׁשֵׁשׁ *corroding,* חָמֵל *becoming dry,* שָׁכֵחַ *forgetting,* שָׁמֵם *desolating,* שָׁפֵל *humbling;* to which many more may be added.

† These, according to D. Kimchi, (*Mikhlol,* fol. ה), are of the same form with גָּדוֹל *great,* קָטֹן *small,* רָחוֹק *distant,* קָרוֹב *near.* The words so found as verbs are, יָרֵא *fearing,* יָקֹשׁ *snaring* as a hunter, יָכֹל *able,* שָׁכֹל *bereaved,* אוֹר *lighting,* גָּנֹב *stealing;* some of which occur as nouns.

nouns to the leading word of the species, whatever be the form or character of such leading word; i. e. whether it include one or more of the guttural letters, or whether it be defective by the loss of one or more of the letters אהרי, ל, or נ: due regard being had to the rules laid down respecting these letters, as well as to those concerning the changes of the vowels. The conjugation, therefore, is but ONE, however varied the ground form or leading word may occasionally appear.

4th, As the changes which take place in the vowels in the conjugation depend, in a great measure, on the situation of the accent, it may be proper here to advert to that subject.

5th, It has been remarked, that in neither of the preceding leading words are the vowels immutable by usage. The nature of the syllabication, therefore, which depends on the situation of the accent, will universally regulate the vowels (Artt. 101. 102. &c.).

6th, It will be seen, by a reference to the paradigm, that the asyllabic adjuncts ־ָה, ־ָי, as well as the syllabic ones ־תֶם and ־תֶן, take the tonic accent with them. The preceding vowels, therefore, of these words, will be shortened as far as circumstances will allow (Art. 104.). In the first case, the vowel immediately preceding is rejected, in order to make way for the exertion of the accent; and, as this restricts the word to its primitive quantity, there is no reason for any further change taking place: we have, therefore, פָּקְדָה and פָּקְדִי, in these instances. In the second case, we have the syllabic adjuncts תֶם, and תֶן, with the tonic accent. The preceding syllable must, therefore, contain an imperfect vowel, in order to comply with the laws of syllabication (Art. 34.). And, as the first vowel is not immutable, it is rejected: the whole word still retaining its primitive quantity, i. e. consisting of two syllables, as in the former case, and no more.

7th, In all the other cases, the accent retains its original situation: and, as the noun seems here to be in apposition, not in construction, with the pronoun, the vowels remain unaltered throughout.

8th, Hence in the second form, exemplified by חָפֵץ *willing*, the (ֵ), when made imperfect, becomes (ֶ) instead of (ְ), by what has been termed an oblique correspondence (Art. 102. 2.), as in חֲפַצְתֶם, חֲפַצְתֶן, which is retained likewise in every other case of increment, in which the accent remains on that syllable. In the remaining cases, when the verb receives the asyllabic augment, ־ָה, and ־ָי, it is rejected.

9th, The first syllable is rejected in חַפַּצְתֶּם, חַפַּצְתֶּן, for the reasons already given. The substitute of *Sheva* (ְ) is added, on account of the guttural letter, see Art. 112. 4.

10th, In the third form, יָכַל, the vowels follow the paradigm of the first, and for the same reasons: except in the third person singular and plural, where the ו entirely disappears.

11th, When, however, verbs receive the illative particle ו* as a prefix, the accent is removed to the first syllable of the verb, which will necessarily be *perfect*, and the following one *imperfect:* as, וּפָקַדְתִּי *and I will visit;* וְיָכָלְתָּ *and thou wilt be able.* The last syllable will be subject to the same law, when the accent is removed on account of any affixed pronoun: as, יְכָלְתִּיו *I have prevailed* (against) *him*, Ps. xiii. 5.

12th, The (ֵ) *Tsēré* of the second form, and of the third and seventh species, viz. פִּקֵּד, and הִתְפַּקֵּד, will undergo the same changes during the process of conjugation, as it does in חָפֵץ in the paradigm.

13th, The following examples present some anomalies, with which the Learner ought to be made acquainted.

On the Third Person Singular Masculine.

In one instance, the verb לָקַח drops its first radical letter: as, לָח *he took*, Ezek. xvii. 5; so, for יָרַד, by a similar omission, we have רָד *he declined*, Judg. xix. 11. But see p. 37, note.

14th, Whenever the third person singular of either gender is accompanied by a pause accent, the final vowel will be made perfect, and, in some instances, changed: as, לֹא יָשָׁב *he has not stood*, Ps. i. 1; שָׁכֵן *he dwelt*, Deut. xxxiii. 12 (Art. 130.). The same often happens in the feminine, as also in the plural number, whenever the accent is drawn back: as, דָּבְקָה *it adheres to*, Job xxix. 10; גָּבְרוּ *they were powerful*, 2 Sam. i. 23 (Art. 127.): all apparently belonging to the roots גָּבַר, שָׁכַן, or

---

* This has generally been termed *Vau conversivum*. But, as I see no necessity whatever for supposing, that it has any such *conversive power* as this name implies, I have rejected it: as it has an illative power, however, and even in Arabic has a manifest influence on the vowels, and sometimes on the consonants of the verbs, I have thought it more consistent to give it the title of *illative*. See Schnabel's Commentary on the Agrumia, p. 26, where this property is ascribed to both و and ف. See p. 53, note.

דָּבַק, respectively. They may, nevertheless, be of the form פָּקֵד, although the other form most frequently occurs in the context. We have something similar to this in Gen. xliii. 14, כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁכֹלְתִּי שָׁכָלְתִּי *even as I am bereaved I am bereaved*, where the first verb is of the form שָׁכַל, and the last of שָׁכֵל.

On the Third Person Singular Feminine.

15th, Our measure is פָּקְדָה in every case. In some few instances, however, we have the Chaldaic instead of the Hebrew feminine termination: as, אֲזָלַת, instead of אָזְלָה Deut. xxxii. 36. So קָרָאת, for קָרְאָה *she called;* עָשָׂת, for עָשְׂתָה *she made;* which seems to shew, that this termination is not a part of the pronoun, but the distinctive form of the feminine gender, as stated above (Art. 201.). The same holds good in the Arabic dialect, where the feminine termination is also ת, which cannot be derived from the feminine pronoun. See also Art. 144. 2.

16th, When the accent is removed from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable, the original vowels of the root will return: as, נָתְנָה *she gave*, Judg. v. 25; שָׂמְחָה *she was glad*, Est. viii. 15. So, נָשְׁתָה *it hath failed*, Is. xli. 17, with an euphonic *Dāgésh* in the ת (Art. 127.).

17th, In Ezek. xxxi. 5, we have גָּבְהָא for גָּבְהָה, the Chaldaic for the Hebrew termination.

On the Third Person Plural, Common Gender.

18th, We have a final ן sometimes added to this part of the verb, which is either intended to obviate a hiatus, or, as in the augmented nouns, to give some emphasis to the sentence: as, יָדְעוּן *they knew*, Deut. viii. 3; צָקוּן for צָקוּ *they pour out*, Is. xxvi. 16. See Art. 188.

19th, In some cases, this plural form appears with the vowel (ֶ) and ה: as, שָׁפְכָה *they poured out*, where the קְרִי, or marginal reading, has שָׁפְכוּ, which is, most likely, the true one. According to the Masora, as cited by Buxtorf, there are fourteen such instances as these in the Biblical text, (Thes. Gram. p. 102.*) In a few cases the ה is not found: as, אָמַר *they said.*

---

* Ed. 1630.

20th, When the accent is on any account drawn back, the original vowels return: as, יָלְדוּ *they have brought forth*, Gen. xxxi. 43; חָדֲלוּ *they ceased*, Judg. v. 7; נָזְלוּ *they became debased*, Is. lxiii. 19, lxiv. 2; יָכְלוּ *they were able*, Exod. viii. 14. In a few instances, a paragogic א is added: as, הֶהֱלִכוּא Jos. x. 24 (Artt. 127. 183. 3.).

On the Second Person Masculine Singular.

21st, Instead of the termination תְּ, we sometimes have תָּה, which is the more usual termination of the pronoun (Art. 153. 2.): as, בָּגַדְתָּה *thou hast dealt perfidiously*, Mal. ii. 14; זָקַנְתָּה *thou art grown old*, Josh. xiii. 1, &c.

22d, Whenever the root ends in ת, and also receives this pronominal affix, both these letters will coalesce by *Dāgésh*: as, כָּרַתְּ *thou hast cut*, Deut. xx. 20, for כָּרַתְתְּ. When נ is the last letter of the root, and this or any similar suffix is added, the נ is dropped (Art. 82.), and, for this, a compensation is made by inserting *Dāgésh forte* in the first letter of the affix; as, נָתַתָּה, for נָתַנְתָּה *thou gavest*, Gen. iii. 12. So, נָתַתִּי, for נָתַנְתִּי *I gave*; נְתַתֶּם, for נְתַנְתֶּם *you gave*, &c.

On the Second Person Singular Feminine.

23d, When the last radical letter happens to be ח, or ע, (-) stands in the place of the first *Shĕvá* (Art. 49.): as, לָקַחַתְּ, for לָקַחְתְּ* *thou didst receive*, 1 Kings xiv. 3; שָׁמַעַתְּ *thou didst hear*, Jer. iv. 19; יָדַעַתְּ *thou didst know*, Jer. l. 24. In roots ending in נ, that letter will be dropped as before: נָתַתְּ *thou gavest*, Ezek. xvi. 33.

24th, In many instances, particularly in the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, this affix assumes the form תִּי, for תְּ, which is also a termination of the original pronoun (See Art. 153. 2. 187. note): as, קָרָאתִי *thou wilt call*, for קָרָאתְ Jer. iii. 4; שָׁמַעְתִּי *thou hast heard*, Ib. iv. 19; to which many others may be added.

On the Second Person Plural Masculine.

25th, We have occasionally a *Khīrík* with the second radical letter, instead of (-): as, יִרְשְׁתֶּם, for יִרְשְׁתֶּם *ye shall possess*, Deut. iv. 1.

---

* In some editions only.

In others (ּ): as, שְׁאַלְתֶּם *ye asked*, 1 Sam. xii. 13; and, as before, נְתַתֶּם, for נְתַנְתֶּם *ye gave*, Jer. xxxvii. 18 (Art. 82.).

On the Second Person Plural Feminine.

26th, Instead of the termination ־תֶּן, we sometimes have ־תֶּנָה, which is also a termination peculiar to the pronoun of this person (Art. 153. 2.); הִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה *ye cast forth*, Amos iv. 3. (This, however, is an example belonging to the *Hiphḥíl* species).

On the First Person Singular, common gender.

27th, A few verbs have *Khīrík* for their second vowel: as יָלַדְתִּי* *I have begotten*, Ps. ii. 7, for יָלַדְתִּי. So, שָׁאַלְתִּי* for שָׁאַלְתִּי *I asked*, 1 Sam. i. 20. Here also, as before, (Nos. 22. 23.) roots ending in ת, or ן, will reject those letters, and supply their place by *Dāgésh*.

28th, In the first person plural also, roots ending in ן will cause that letter to coalesce with the נ of the pronominal suffix: as, נָתַנּוּ (for נָתַנְנוּ) *we gave*, Lam. v. 7.

29th, Upon the whole, then, these are rather apparent than real anomalies. It is consistent with the analogy of this language to make certain changes in the vowels, upon the occurrence of any of the guttural letters. The concurrence of any two identical letters is also regularly expressed, by placing a *Dāgésh* in one of them, and omitting the other, provided no vowel ought to intervene (Art. 51.). *Nún* נ likewise is regularly rejected, whenever it should receive a

---

* But perhaps these vowels do not belong to the form פָּקַד, but פָּקֹד, or perhaps, פָּקִיד. יָרַשׁ, יָרַת, is certainly the root in Arabic to which יְרֵשִׁתֶם may be referred; and יָלִיד *a son*, may be the root of the second, and שָׁאַל, Arab. سَائِل *a beggar*, of the third. And hence, perhaps, it is, that the same root is occasionally found with different vowels. In Arabic, also, we have خَفِيَ *hiding one's self*; خَفَّيَ *concealing something*; رَفَعَ *he raised*; and رَفِعَ *he was elevated, ennobled*; رَفُعَ *he had a high voice*, &c. De Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 119.

final *Shĕvá* (Art. 82.). Other varieties in the vowels may be accounted for, by supposing different nouns derived from the same primitive, to have been originally taken as the leading word.

30th, N. B. The remarks here made on the Preterite tense of the first species *Kal*, will apply, in a great measure, to those of all the rest.

On the Present Tense of the First Species Kal.

202. It has been remarked (Art. 195. 9.) that the leading word of this tense in *Kal* is always one or other of the Segolate nouns of the Forms פְּקֶד, פְּקֶד, or פְּקֶד. There are, however, a few examples, in which פְּקוּד is the form taken, as we shall see presently. These nouns are generally abstract as to sense (Art. 160. 10.): if, then, a personal pronoun, or any abridged form of it, be affixed, we shall have a meaning something like the following: *He* (is) *a visiting; Thou* (art) *a coming*, &c. where the words *visiting* and *coming* are not used as participles, but as abstract nouns, which must necessarily intimate a *present* tense. How this, as well as the preterite, tense, is used in composition, will be shewn when we come to the Syntax.

Paradigm of the Present Tense.

Form I. פְּקֶד.

Singular.

Pers.	Masc.	Etymon.		Fem.	Etymon.	
3	יִפְקֹד	for הִוא פֹּקֵד	*He visits.*	תִּפְקֹד	unknown.	*She visits.*
2	תִּפְקֹד	— אַתָּה פֹּקֵד	*Thou visitest.*	תִּפְקְדִי	אַתְּי פֹּקֵד	*Thou*, fem.
1	אֶפְקֹד	— אֲנִי פֹּקֵד	*I visit.*	אֶפְקֹד	as before.	*I*, fem.

PLURAL.

Pers.	Masc.	Etymon.		Fem.	Etymon.	
3	יִפְקְדוּ for הֵמָּה or הֵם הוּ	הֵיא פְקָד הוּ	*They visit.*	תִּפְקֹדְנָה for הֵנָּה	פְּקָד הֵנָּה	*They visit.*
2	תִּפְקְדוּ —	Id.	*You visit.*	תִּפְקֹדְנָה	אַתֶּנָּה פְּקָד	*You visit.*
1	נִפְקֹד	נַחְנוּ פְקָד	*We visit.*	נִפְקֹד	as before.	*We visit.*

2d, In resolving these Forms, we have given הֵיא פְקָד for יִפְקֹד, after Jahn. His reason is, that this pronoun was formerly used for both genders, which is not improbable. Still, I believe, the י is put for ה: the pronunciation being nearly the same as if the ה was actually prefixed, not *Yifkód*, but *Ifkód*. The aspiration may have been lost in process of time, as it is the case with many words among ourselves, where *h* is unaspirated: as in *hour*, *humble*, and even in some cases *gh:* as, *daughter*, *knight*, *light*, &c. In Syriac and Arabic the same is the case: as, *ensuro*, not *yensuro*, for ܢܨܘܪ ينصر and so of others (Art. 14.).

3d, The etymon of תִּפְקֹד, fem., I have stated as unknown: because, I cannot agree with what has hitherto been said on that subject. If, however, י is put for ה in the masculine, ת might have been chosen for the feminine, which becomes a substitute for ה on many occasions (Art. 151. 4.). Or, if הֵיא be taken as the original masculine form, הֵיאָה, or חֵיָה might have been formerly used as its feminine. In Arabic we still have حَيٌّ, חַי, which would require to be written in Hebrew in full, חַיָּה. If this be the case, ת may stand for חַיַּת, a fragment of this pronoun in the state of construction. The form תִּפְקְדִי may, perhaps, stand for אַתִּי פְקָד, with the י of אַתִּי transposed, as we say, *what man soever*, for *whatsoever man*, &c. in English.

4th, Of יִפְקְדוּ the same may be said which has been said of others (Art. 147. 7. note). As to the ת prefixed to the feminine, what has just been said of תִּפְקֹד must suffice. The נָה suffixed is probably a fragment of the pronoun הֵנָּה, as Jahn has observed (Gram. p. 177. Ed. 1809.). The derivations of the other forms are sufficiently obvious.

5th, Paradigm of the Second Form פִּקֵּד.*

SINGULAR.

Pers.	Masc.		Fem.	
3	יִשְׁכַּב	*He lies down.*	תִּשְׁכַּב	*She lies down.*
2	תִּשְׁכַּב	*Thou liest down.*	תִּשְׁכְּבִי	*Thou liest down.*
1	אֶשְׁכַּב	*I lie down.*	אֶשְׁכַּב	*I lie down.*

PLURAL.

3	יִשְׁכְּבוּ	*They lie down.*	תִּשְׁכַּבְנָה	*They lie down.*
2	תִּשְׁכְּבוּ	*You lie down.*	תִּשְׁכַּבְנָה	*You lie down.*
1	נִשְׁכַּב	*We lie down.*	נִשְׁכַּב	*We lie down.*

6th, Paradigm of the Third Form פִּקֵּד.

This form never occurs except in verbs which are subject to some defect, and then but seldom.

Example.

SINGULAR.

Pers.	Masc.			Fem.	
3	יִתֵּן	for	יִנְתֵּן *He gives* (Art. 82.)	תִּתֵּן	*She gives.*
2	תִּתֵּן	—	תִּנְתֵּן *Thou givest.*	תִּתְּנִי	*Thou givest.*
1	אֶתֵּן or אֶתְּנָה	—	אֶנְתֵּן *I give.*	אֶתֵּן or אֶתְּנָה	*I give.*

PLURAL.

Pers.	Masc.		Fem.
3	יִתְּנוּ	*They give.*	wanting.
2	תִּתְּנוּ	*Ye give.*	
1	נִתֵּן or נִתְּנָה	*We give.*	

---

* So יִרְכַּב *he rides*; יִרְבַּד *he spreads*; יִרְבַּץ *he lies down*; יִגְדַּל *he increases*, &c. When the last letter is guttural, the final vowel is, for the most part, (-): as, יִשְׁמַע *he hears*; יִשְׁלַח *he sends*; יִגְבַּהּ *he rises, is exalted.* This also will be the case, when the middle letter is guttural, as it is with the Segolate nouns (Art. 156. 9.).

7th, It has been remarked (Art. 202.), that the form of פָּקוֹד is sometimes taken as the leading word of the Present tense. But, of this form we have met with the following examples only: viz. Exod. xviii. 26, יִשְׁפּוֹטוּ *they judge;* תִּשְׁמוֹר *it* (fem.) *preserves*, or *keeps*, Prov. xiv. 3; תַּעֲבוֹרִי *pass thou over* (fem.), Ruth ii. 8; אָנוּשָׁה (for אָאֳנוּשָׁה Art. 78.) *I am mortally pained*, Ps. lxix. 21.

8th, According to our system, indeed, any noun may be conjugated with the pronouns, respect being had to its signification: and hence it appears to be, that so many forms have been thus found; while so few have generally obtained as verbs.

9th, Of these forms, the first פָּקוֹד is by far the most generally used in *Kal:* and, for the most part, it has a transitive signification. פָּקֵד occurs but seldom, and is mostly intransitive. פְּקֹד is perhaps not to be found in another example, if we except the final (ֶ) or (ֹ) in several verbs having א with *Khōlém* for their first radical letter; as, אֹמֵר or אָמֵר, יֹאמֵר or יֹאמַר, &c.

10th, In all cases wherein the terminating vowel is perfect, and accompanied regularly by an accent, upon the accent's being withdrawn (which always takes place when the verb is joined with any other word by *Makkáph*, &c.), such final vowel will be changed for its correspondent *imperfect one* (Art. 140, &c.): as, אֶשְׁמָר־לוֹ *I will keep for him*, Ps. lxxxix. 29; אֶתְמָךְ־בּוֹ *I will sustain him*, Is. xlii. 1, for אֶשְׁמֹר and אֶתְמֹךְ respectively.*

11th, The same verb is sometimes found to occur in more than one of the forms: as, יִשְׁבָּת *he rested*, Gen. ii. 2; and תִּשְׁבַּת *it rests*, Neh. vi. 3; לֹא אֶחְפָּץ *I am not willing*, Ezek. xviii. 32; and יֶחְפָּץ

---

* It is a curious fact, that the tense corresponding to this in the Arabic verbs, is subject to the same government with the nouns, i. e. having terminations answering to those of the nominative and objective cases. This tense they term مُضَارِع *alike*, because it is said *to be like the noun*. In a few instances, indeed, we have the ا of the accusative with the verb: as, لَنَسْفَعًا *we will surely draw*, &c. In others we have an additional ن, ل, as in the nouns of excess (Art. 176.): as, بَنْصُرَنْ *he will surely assist*.

he will approve, Ps. xxxvii. 23; יִטְרֹף *he will tear*, Ps. vii. 3; and יִטְרָף Gen. xlix. 27. To which many others may be added. (See the Mikhlol of D. Kimchi, fol. ב, verso.). This may be accounted for by supposing, that the Segolate noun belonging to both forms was once in use.

12th, When, however, any paragogic letter is added, this distinctive vowel, be what it may, disappears (as it is the case with the Segolate nouns): as, אֶשְׁמְרָה, not אֶשְׁמֹרָה *I will keep*, Ps. xxxix. 2; אֶשְׁכְּבָה, not אֶשְׁכָּבָה *I will lie down*, Ps. iv. 9; אַהַרְגָה *I will kill*, not אַהֲרֹגָה Gen. xxvii. 41. In the last case, the substitute of *Shĕvá* is resolved by Art. 112. 2.

13th, In a few instances the letter ו is still retained, which was perhaps formerly a *mater lectionis*: i. e. was used instead of the vowel וֹ *Khōlém*: as, אֶשְׁקוֹטָה *I rest*, Isa. xviii. 4; אֶשְׁקוֹלָה *I weigh*, Ezra viii. 25. In which cases the קְרִי, or marginal reading, generally gives the more usual form. This ו, however, is mostly omitted, and *Kāméts Khātéf* then found to supply the place of the rejected *Khōlém* (see Art. 160. 3.): as, אֶפְשָׁעָה *I step*, Isa. xxvii. 4; אֶשְׁמָעָה *I hear*, Dan. viii. 13; תִּשְׁחָדִי *thou bribest*, Ezek. xvi. 33. In some copies, however, we have (:) *Shĕvá* only in most of these cases, which is perhaps the true reading.

14th, With the third person plural masculine we sometimes have an additional paragogic ן, supplied, perhaps, for the sake of euphony: as, יִשְׁמְעוּן *they will hear*, Exod. iv. 9. Sometimes the preceding vowel is perfect: as, יִשְׁאָלוּן *they will ask*, Josh. iv. 6; יִקְצֹרוּן *they will reap*, Ruth ii. 9. (See Art. 187.)

15th, When the first radical letter happens to be a guttural, the substitute of *Shĕvá* will be resolved into its cognate imperfect vowel: as, יַאַרְכוּ *they will extend* (for יַאֲרְכוּ, by analogy יֶאֱרְכוּ, see Art. 112. 2.).

16th, In the feminine, we have תִּשְׁכַּבְנָה for תִּשְׁכְּבְנָה, by Art. 187. 5, &c. Ezek. xvii. 23. The final ה is sometimes omitted by apocope, by Art. 80, of which more will be said hereafter.

17th, The abbreviated pronouns are regularly prefixed to the present tense, in every species, with *Shĕvá* (:): as, יִפְקֹד; but here, as two *Shĕvás* cannot concur at the commencement of a word, the first is changed to (·), (-), or (ֽ:), as circumstances may require, (Art.

112., &c.): as, יִפְקֹד, יֵאָרֵךְ, אֶפְקֹד, &c. Where no such necessity exists, *Shĕvá* remains, as it does with the particles בכלם, (Art. 181. &c.): as, וְפִקֹּד, כְּפִקֹּד, מְפִקֹּד, &c.

18th, The principles, therefore, by which the vowels of both the verbs and nouns are regulated, are precisely the same. This is also true of the letters, as well as the forms of words: for these, as we have already seen, are such as the nature of the several cases seems to require.

Of the Infinitives and Imperatives.

203. Which of these two ought to take the precedence, it is difficult to say; both presenting the same form. But, as that which has been termed the Imperative is sometimes found conjugated with one or other of the pronouns, the Infinitive has usually been placed first, as exhibiting the more simple form of the verb.

2d, It is now pretty generally agreed, that the Infinitive (as it has been termed) is nothing more than a Verbal noun, having either an active, neuter, or passive signification: as, פָּקוֹד, and in construction, פְּקֹד *a visiting, visitatio,* or the like, the signification of which is active; and, שְׁכַב *lying down,* which is neuter. In some instances, these forms will have a passive signification.

3d, Any of these words, according to Schrœder, when pronounced with some emphasis, will become imperative in signification: as, פָּקֹד or פְּקֹד *inspicere!* i. e. "*inspice,* vel *inspicite.*" So, continues he, "Ab initio nullum discrimen habuit numeri et generis: e. g. שְׁמוֹעַ *audire!* non tantum pro *audi,* sed et pro *audite,* Deut. i. 16; צָרוֹר *infestare!* pro *infestate,* Num. xxv. 17, &c.

4th, Having premised thus much, we may now come to the forms, and other particulars, connected with this species of words.

5th, The forms of the Infinitives are numerous: they may be either primitive or augmented, according to the sense required by the context. We shall, at present, notice only the primitive forms, reserving the others till we come to treat on the augmented species of the conjugation.

Forms of the Infinitive or Verbal Noun, belonging to the First Species of the Conjugation KAL.

6th, פְּקֹד, constr. פִּקֹּד* is the most frequent: פֶּקֶד, פָּקוּד, פִּקֵּד, פִּקַּד, and פְּקֻדַּ are more rare. These forms are peculiar to the masculine gender. The following are feminine: פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּה, פְּקֻדָּת, פְּקֻדָּת, פְּקֻדָּת, &c. These are all, excepting the first three, of the forms of the Segolate nouns (Artt. 156. 157. &c.); and, as these nouns are for the most part abstracts (Art. 160. 10.), they are well suited for the functions which they here sustain.

7th, These, when in conjunction with any of the particles בכלם, will afford a sense similar to that of the Gerunds in Latin: as, בִּפְקֹד *in visiting;* לִפְקֹד *for visiting;* כִּפְקֹד *according to the act of visiting;* מִפְּקֹד *from,* or *by, the act of visiting.* In which cases, the form proper for construction is necessarily taken, on account of the following context.

8th, In like manner with the pronouns, פְּקֻדִּי *my visiting;* פְּקֻדְּךָ *thy visiting,* &c. in which פְּקֻדַּ is preferred.†

9th, When the terminating vowel (וֹ of פְּקֹד) happens to lose the accent, it becomes imperfect as in the nouns: as, מַלְכוּת *a king's*

---

* Of this form in the nouns is גְּדוֹל, constr. גְּדֹל, רְחוֹק, רָחֹק, קָרוֹב, which imply *habit, custom,* &c.; and sometimes have an abstract signification.

† The nouns equivalent to these in Arabic are subject to the same usage: and they are occasionally found in the plural number, which never occurs in Hebrew. In the last instance, Grammarians have thought, that a transposition of the *o* has taken place, supposing פְּקֹד to have been the original form. But as פְּקֻדָּה is regularly the feminine form of פְּקֻדַּ, I do not see why פְּקֻדִּי may not be derived from the same form, particularly as these forms are in use.

reigning, Gen. xxxvi. 31. In one instance we have an additional י inserted: as, לְדָרְיוֹשׁ הַדָּבָר *for investigating the matter*, Ezra x. 16.

10th, Buxtorf* thinks, that, in the phrases לְמָשְׁחָה *for anointing*, Exod. xxix. 29; לְגָבְהָה *for elevating*, Zeph. iii. 11; לְחַמְלָה *for using patience*, Ezek. xvi. 5, the *o* has been transposed, on account of the additional paragogic ה. But, the truth of this I doubt. First, because ה is not here paragogic, but feminine, as the situation of the accent is sufficient to shew. In the next place, it is not necessary to suppose, that the *o* is transposed, for reasons just given (No. 8, note): and hence we have, in the next example adduced by him, לְרַחֲקָה *for removing far away*, Ezek. viii. 6, where the *o* is not transposed, but remains in its original situation.

11th, Again, the examples which he also gives, viz. כְּשָׁמְעָתוֹ, בְּקָרְבָתָם shew, beyond all doubt, that the ה above mentioned is of the feminine gender, and not paragogic. Other examples are, שַׁחֲטָה *slaying*, Hos. v. 2; שְׁאָלָה *asking*, Isa. vii. 11; יִרְאָה *fearing*, Deut. iv. 10. These, however, Buxtorf confesses, after all, are feminine forms of the Infinitive, which the Jewish Grammarians term Verbal Nouns.

12th, It will be difficult, perhaps, and certainly unnecessary, to lay down rules for the use of the other forms. The Student may note them down as they occur. We will merely remark, that cases will happen here, as in the Arabic, in which it will be extremely difficult to say, whether a noun is to be referred to this class, or to that of the participles: and further, that, it is not improbable, the very same word may occasionally be found in a situation suitable to both.

On the Imperative belonging to the First Species.

204. This is usually פְּקֹד or פָּקֹד *visit*, for the second person singular masculine; פִּקְדִי, for the same feminine; פִּקְדוּ, masc. and פִּקֹדְנָה or פָּקֹדְנָה, fem. for the same person plural. In which will be perceived some of the fragments of the pronouns as already mentioned (Art. 202.).

---

* Thes. Gram. lib. i. c. xiii.

2d, It has already been remarked, that the form פָּקוֹד is sometimes used for both numbers and genders (Art. 203. 3.).

3d, As the Imperative is generally formed on the same word with the Infinitive, it will occasionally be found with the feminine termination ־ָה, as also with the same vowels: as, שָׁמְרָה *keep*,* Ps. xxv. 20; זָכְרָה *remember*, 2 Chron. vi. 42. *Khōlém* remains unchanged in זְעֹמָה *vilify, curse*, Num. xxiii. 7. Judg. xix. 5, we have סְעָד *support* (from the form סְעַד), and v. 8, סְעָד with *Makkáph* (from סְעַד): and, 1 Kings xiii. 7, סְעָדָה (from סְעָד) with the paragogic letter ־ָה, whence it should seem, that each of these forms of the verbal noun was once in use.

4th, שְׁכַב *lie down*, of the form פְּקֹד, will, upon receiving the feminine termination, lose (-), and then change the first (:) into *Khīrík*: as, שִׁכְבָה. Upon the same principle, the *o* of פְּקֹד is generally rejected: as in פִּקְדִי, פִּקְדוּ, &c., as above (Art. 202. 12.). In נִצְרָה *keep*, Ps. cxli. 3, we have either an euphonic or intensitive *Dāgésh*.

5th, Of the form פִּקְדִי, חָרְבוּ *destroy ye*, Jer. ii. 12; מָשְׁכוּ *draw ye*, Ezek. xxxii. 20; שָׁדְדוּ *lay ye waste*, Jer. xlix. 28, are instances. So מָלְכִי *reign thou*, fem., Judg. ix. 10; צָעֲקִי *cry thou*, Jer. xxii. 20; (the medial ר has been added on account of the accent's being drawn back, Art. 127. 4.); חָרְבִי *make thou dry*, Is. xliv. 27.

6th, When a guttural is the first letter of the root, (ֲ) is taken instead of *Khīrík* (ִ) whenever any asyllabic augment is affixed to the word: as, חֲשִׂפִי *make thou bare*, fem., Isa. xlvii. 2; אֲחֲזִי *take thou*, fem., Ruth iii. 15.

7th, חָסְמִי *divine thou*, 1 Sam. xxviii. 8, takes a substitute of *Shĕvá* with the second radical letter, upon the principle of assimilation, noticed Art. 114., for חָסְמִי. This is sometimes found to take place in the present tense also.

8th, The feminine plural occasionally suffers apocope: as, שְׁמַעַן Gen. iv. 23, for שְׁמַעְנָה *hear ye*, which also happens in the present tense, as will be seen hereafter.

---

* See Ps. cxli. 3, where this word is used as a noun; unless, indeed, we construe the former word שִׁיתָה with it: thus, שִׁיתָה שָׁמְרָה *place, keep*, i. e. keep constantly.

On the Participles.

205. We now come to that species of words which have been termed Participles, and classed with the verbs as such: contrary perhaps to every principle of the Hebrew Grammar. The fact is, these are nothing more than attributives of one form or other, into the etymology of which nothing having the least connection with tense has ever entered. Nor, are the forms usually ascribed to these words, exclusively applicable to nouns of this sort. חָכָם *wise*, רָחוֹק *distant*, גָּדֵל *growing*, being just as much participles as פּוֹקֵד masc., fem. פּוֹקֶדֶת and פּוֹקֶדֶת *visiting*, or פָּקוּד, masc., פְּקוּדָה, fem. *visited*, can possibly be; to which a considerable number of others may be added. The fact appears to be, that all these nouns, together with those conjugated as verbs (which, indeed, is sometimes the case with some of these), are to be regulated in tense by other considerations, which will hereafter be mentioned.

2d, It is curious enough to remark, that Simonis has, in his Arcanum Formarum, assigned a whole section to words of the form usually ascribed to the first participle, in which they occur as *agents*, without the least reference whatever to tense. Yet, in one of his notes he says,* " Exinde vero non sequitur, omnia *Participia* mera esse Nomina, quod contendit Pagninus in *Institut.* Hebr. p. 229. If by this he means, that these words may occasionally be construed as participles, perhaps no one will object: but, if he contends, that they are not originally nouns, I believe, he will contend for that, for which no proof can be given.

* P. 601.

LECTURE XI.

206. Having dwelt thus much on the first species of the Hebrew Conjugation, which is indeed the model, and contains the principles, upon which all the rest are formed, we may now proceed to give the others, with such notes as shall seem necessary.

Paradigm of the Second Species, or Passive Form of the First usually termed NIPHHAL. נִפְעַל.

PRETERITE TENSE.

SINGULAR NUMBER.

Pers.	Masc.		Fem.	
3	נִפְקַד	*He was visited.*	נִפְקְדָה	*She was visited.*
2	נִפְקַדְתָּ	*Thou wast visited.*	נִפְקַדְתְּ	*Thou wast visited.*
1	נִפְקַדְתִּי	*I was visited.*	נִפְקַדְתִּי	*I was visited.*

PLURAL NUMBER.

3	נִפְקְדוּ	*They were visited.*	נִפְקְדוּ	*They were visited.*
2	נִפְקַדְתֶּם	*Ye were visited.*	נִפְקַדְתֶּן	*Ye were visited.*
1	נִפְקַדְנוּ	*We were visited.*	נִפְקַדְנוּ	*We were visited.*

PRESENT TENSE.

SINGULAR NUMBER.

3	יִפָּקֵד	*He becomes visited.*	תִּפָּקֵד	*She becomes visited.*
2	תִּפָּקֵד	*Thou becomest visited.*	תִּפָּקְדִי	*Thou becomest visited.*
1	אִפָּקֵד	*I become visited.*	אִפָּקֵד	*I become visited.*

PLURAL NUMBER.

3	יִפָּקְדוּ	*They become visited.*	תִּפָּקַדְנָה	*They become visited.*
2	תִּפָּקְדוּ	*Ye become visited.*	תִּפָּקַדְנָה	*Ye become visited.*
1	נִפָּקֵד	*We become visited.*	נִפָּקֵד	*We become visited.*

IMPERATIVE.

SINGULAR.

	Masc.		Fem.	
2	הִפָּקֵד	*Be thou visited.*	הִפָּקְדִי	*Be thou visited.*

PLURAL.

2	הִפָּקְדוּ	*Be ye visited.*	הִפָּקֵדְנָה	*Be ye visited.*

Forms of the INFINITIVE, *or Abstract Verbal Noun.*

הִפָּקֵד, הִפָּקֵד, נִפָּקֵד, נִפָּקֵד, הִפָּקֵד, and הִפָּקֹד *being visited, &c.*

PARTICIPLES *(usually), rather* VERBAL CONCRETE NOUNS.

SINGULAR.

נִפְקָד or נִפְקוֹד נִפְקֶדֶת and נִפְקָדָה *Visited, &c.*

PLURAL.

נִפְקָדִים נִפְקָדוֹת *Ib.*

We have here given the Infinitives, Participles, &c. as usually found in the Paradigm, which we shall do in all the rest of the Species; not because we believe this arrangement to be the best, but, because we would depart as little as may be from the method usually adopted; and, in order to familiarize the mind of the Learner with the several forms of nouns which most frequently occur.

2d, The sense afforded by this species is mostly passive; sometimes, however, it is *active:* as, נִלְחַם *he fought;* נִשְׁבַּע *he swore:* נִשְׁעַן *he reclined;* נִשְׁפַּט *he contended;* where co-operation seems rather to be implied. Sometimes, too, it is reflective: as, נִשְׁמַר *watching one's self;* נִשְׁאַל *asking for self;* and at others, its force may be expressed in English, by using, *may, can, must, ought,* or the like. See Gen. vi. 21; xvi. 10; xx. 9. All of which may be very well comprehended in the compound form of this word, when regulated by the circumstances mentioned in the context. See Art. 165. 18. 20.

On the Preterite Tense.

3d, When the primitive words happens to begin with a guttural letter, the vowel accompanying נ may be either (ֶ) or (־), but not (ָ): as, נֶחְשַׁב *accounted*, Num. xviii. 27; נֶאֱמַר *said*, Dan. viii. 26; נֶהֱפְכוּ *overturned*, Esth. ix. 1; נֶחְתָּם *sealed*, Ib. viii. 8; נֶעְתַּר *placated*, 1 Chron. v. 20; where we have the form פְּקֹד or פָּקֹד, instead of פָּקַד which is mostly used in this species. So נְמוֹל and נִמּוֹלוּ *circumcised*, Gen. xvii. 27, for נִמְוָל (Art. 82.). In one instance נ seems to have been affixed to one of the augmented forms נְכַפֵּר *it shall expiate*, Deut. xxi. 8, for נִתְכַּפֵּר, in full נִתְכַּפֵּר (Art. 89. 2.), of the form הִתְפַּקֵּד.

4th, In נֶאשְׁאַר *left*, Ezek. ix. 8, the additional word forming this species (see Art. 165. 18.) seems to be given more at length than usual. Buxtorf thinks we have here a form compounded of both tenses, than which nothing can be more unlikely.* For ה in נִפְקְדָה we sometimes have the Chaldee ת, as in *Kal* (Art. 202. 16); as, נִשְׁכַּחַת *forgotten*, Is. xxiii. 15.

5th, נִגְאֲלוּ *they were polluted*, Lam. iv. 14, on the form פֹּקֵד, probably from גּוֹאֵל *an avenger*. The form פָּקֵד is also in use: as, תִּגְאֲלוּ *ye are avenged*, or *redeemed*, Is. lii. 3. Of the same form with the preceding, is נֹאחֲזוּ *they shall be possessed of*, Num. xxxii. 30. In the word נֶאְדָּרִי Exod. xv. 6, we have perhaps an abbreviated form for נֶאְדָּרָה הָיָא *it is become glorious*, the preceding word יָמִין being regularly of the feminine gender. This, therefore, need not be considered as anomalous, in any other point of view.

On the Present Tense, Imperative, &c.

6th, The form mostly taken for this tense is פָּקֵד, and sometimes the feminine form פְּקֵדָה: פָּקֹד and פָּקַד are also found, as in *Kal*: but, פָּקֹד is found only with the Infinitive or verbal noun, examples of each of which will presently be given.

---

* Thes. Gram. lib. i. c. xiv. ad particip. *Niphhát*.

7th, א is sometimes regularly prefixed with (·) for the first person singular: as, אִדָּרֵשׁ *I am enquired of*, Ezek. xiv. 3; אִשָּׁבֵעַ *I swear*, Gen. xxi. 24. With the feminine form: as, אִמָּלְטָה *I escape*, Ib. xix. 20; אִכָּבְדָה *I am honoured*, Exod. xiv. 17; also found אֶכָּבְדָה Hag. i. 8, where the ה seems to have been lost, as in other instances (Art. 78, &c.). in most of which, however, it is restored in the marginal reading.

8th, For תִּשָּׁבֵר, we have תִּשָּׁבֶר *thou wilt* be broken*, Ezek. xxxii. 28. So יֶאֱנַשׁ *he was infirm*, 2 Sam. xii. 15; יִנָּפַשׁ *he was refreshed*, Exod. xxxi. 17; יִגָּמַל *he was weaned*, Gen. xxi. 8; יֵאָמֵר *it was said*, Josh. ii. 2. So also, תִּזָּכֵרְנָה *they shall be commemorated*, Is. lxv. 17; תֵּאָכֵלְנָה *they shall be eaten up*, Jer. xxiv. 2, to which many more may be added.†

9th, To the plural יִפָּקְדוּ a paragogic ן is often added as in *Kal*: as, יִכָּרְתוּן *they shall be cut off*, Ps. xxxvii. 9, &c.

10th, We have in the Imperative, נִקָּבְצוּ *assemble yourselves*, Joel iv. 11, for הִקָּבְצוּ, which seems to be grounded on the form פִּקָּד or פָּקָד.

11th, Whenever, in this, as in other instances, the first letter of the root is incapable of receiving *Dāgésh forte*, the preceding vowel is necessarily made perfect, as in יֶאֱנַשׁ &c. above given (No. 8.).

12th, In the Infinitive we have הֵאָכֵל *eating*, Levit. vii. 18; הִנָּתוֹן *giving*, Jer. xxxii. 4. And with נ for the first letter, נִלְחֹם *fighting together*, Judg. xi. 25; נִשְׁאֹל *requesting*, 1 Sam. xx. 28; נִכְסֹף *desiring*, Gen. xxxi. 30; נִשְׁלֹחַ *sending*, Esth. iii. 13; נִגּוֹף, for נִגְּפוֹף *striking*, Judg. xx. 39, on the form פָּקוֹד or פִּקּוֹד. To these may be referred הִנָּדֹף (by Art. 82.), for הִנָּדֵף or הִנָּדֵף *propelling*, Ps. lxviii. 3. We also have אִדָּרוֹשׁ *enquiring*, Ezek. xiv. 3, of the same form, with א, instead of ה prefixed; which is the letter usually taken by the Chaldees and Syrians.

13th, The *Dāgésh forte* found in the first radical letter in these verbs is merely compensative for the characteristic נ which has been rejected according to rule (Art. 82.).

---

* Reasons for translating this present tense by a future will be given in the Syntax.

† Buxtorf. Thes. Gram. lib. i. c. xiv.

14th, The noun, given as a participle, has, in a few instances, (ֵ) instead of (ֶ): as, נֵקֵשׁ (for נֵקֶשׁ, form נַפֵּחַ Art. 93.) *taken in a net*, Ps. ix. 17. Alting* is of opinion, that the plurals נְבִיאִים *persons prophesying*, 1 Sam. xix. 20, Jer. xiv. 15, Ezek. xiii. 16; נֶחְבָּאִים *hidden*, Josh. x. 17; נִטְמְאִים *polluted*, Ezek. xx. 30, 31; נִמְצָאִים *found*, Esth. i. 5, iv. 16, 1 Sam. xiii. 15, and some others, are formed on the measure נִפְקָד. But this is by no means necessary. The (ֶ) of the singular is, it is true, mostly found with the second radical: as, נִבְאִים, but then, this vowel is not immutable, but may be altered for the mere sake of euphony, which is perhaps the case in all these instances.

207. *Paradigm of the Conjugation of a Verb of the Third Species,* PIHHEL.

PRETERITE TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
3	פִּקֵּד	פִּקְּדָה	פִּקְּדוּ	פִּקֵּדוּ
2	פִּקַּדְתָּ	פִּקַּדְתְּ	פִּקַּדְתֶּם	פִּקַּדְתֶּן
1	פִּקַּדְתִּי	פִּקַּדְתִּי	פִּקַּדְנוּ	פִּקַּדְנוּ

PRESENT TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	יְפַקֵּד	תְּפַקֵּד	יְפַקְּדוּ	תְּפַקֵּדְנָה
2	תְּפַקֵּד	תְּפַקְּדִי	תְּפַקְּדוּ	תְּפַקֵּדְנָה
1	אֲפַקֵּד	אֲפַקֵּד	נְפַקֵּד	נְפַקֵּד

IMPERATIVE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
2	פַּקֵּד	פַּקְּדִי	פַּקְּדוּ	פַּקֵּדְנָה

---

* Sect. vii. §. 119. de verbo perfecto.

INFINITIVE, *or* VERBAL NOUN.

Masc. Form.	Fem. Forms.
פָּקֹד	פְּקֻדּוּת, פְּקֻדַּת, פִּקְדָּה

PARTICIPLES, *or* CONCRETE VERBAL NOUNS.

Singular.		Plural.	
Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
מְפֻקָּד	מְפֻקָּדָה or מְפֻקֶּדֶת	מְפֻקָּדִים	מְפֻקָּדוֹת

Passive Voice of the same, or Fourth Species, which is termed PUHḤAL.

PRETERITE TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	פֻּקַּד	פֻּקְדָה	פֻּקְדוּ	פֻּקְדוּ
2	פֻּקַּדְתָּ	פֻּקַּדְתְּ	פֻּקַּדְתֶּם	פֻּקַּדְתֶּן
1	פֻּקַּדְתִּי	פֻּקַּדְתִּי	פֻּקַּדְנוּ	פֻּקַּדְנוּ

PRESENT TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	יְפֻקַּד	תְּפֻקַּד	יְפֻקְּדוּ	תְּפֻקַּדְנָה
2	תְּפֻקַּד	תְּפֻקְּדִי	תְּפֻקְּדוּ	תְּפֻקַּדְנָה
1	אֶפֻקַּד	אֶפֻקַּד	נְפֻקַּד	נְפֻקַּד

IMPERATIVE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
2	פֻּקַּד	פֻּקְדִי	פֻּקְדוּ	פֻּקַּדְנָה

INFINITIVE, *or* VERBAL NOUN.

פֻּקֹּד

PARTICIPLES, *or* CONCRETE VERBAL NOUNS.

SINGULAR.		PLURAL.	
Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
מְפַקֵּד	מְפַקֶּדֶת or מְפַקֵּדָה	מְפַקְּדִים	מְפַקְּדוֹת

On the Persons, &c. of both Voices of the Third and Fourth Species, PIHḤEL *and* PUHḤAL.

2d, Whenever the last radical letter is either one of the gutturals, or ר, (-) *Páthakh* will be the terminating vowel; which is also found in some other words: פָּקַד will, therefore, be the measure in such cases: as, אִבַּד *he destroyed*, 2 Kings xxi. 3; שִׁבַּר *he broke*, Ps. cvii. 16; בִּלַּע *he swallowed*, Is. xxv. 8; שִׁלַּח *he sent*, Exod. ix. 7, &c. &c. Also when followed by *Mākkáph;* as, לִמַּד־דַּעַת *he taught knowledge*, Eccl. xii. 9.

3d, In a few instances (ֵ) is the terminating vowel: as, דִּבֵּר *he said;* כִּבֵּס *he wasted;* כִּפֵּר *he expiated.*

4th, When any letter incapable of receiving *Dāgésh* is the medial letter of the root, a compensation is made, by changing the preceding imperfect vowel to its correspondent perfect one: as, מֵאֵן *he refused*, for מְאֵן. So בֵּרַךְ *he blessed;* and, in the participle מְבָרֵךְ *blessing;* מְתָאֵב *detesting*, &c.; בֵּאַר *he explained;* אֵחַר *he delayed* (Art. 102. 2.). In a few instances (ִ) *Khīrík* remains, without any apparent compensation: as, בִּעֵר *he removed*, 1 Kings xxii. 47; נִאַץ *he vexed*, Ps. x. 3; לִהַט *he inflamed*, Mal. iii. 19; נִחַם *he consoled*, Is. xlix. 13; אֶחֱרוּ *they delayed*, Judg. v. 28, where א occurs with *Sēgól.* So, in the Participles: מְפַחֵד *fearing*, Prov. xxviii. 14; מְנַהֵל *leading*, Is. li. 18. In all which cases *Dāgésh* is said to be *implied* (Art. 115.).

5th, When the accent is drawn back, in the feminine, פִּקְּדָה, the characteristic vowel (ֶ) returns: as, לִחֲכָה *it licked*, 1 Kings xviii. 38; לִקְטָה *she collected*, Ruth ii. 18, &c. (Art. 127.).

6th, In some instances *Dāgésh forte* is omitted in a letter capable of receiving it: as, שִׁלְחָה *she sent*, Ezek. xvii. 7: שִׁלְחוּ *they sent*, Ps. lxxiv. 7. So, הַלְלוּ *passim*, for הַלְּלוּ *praise ye.* See Art. 119.

7th, We have in the participle מַלְּפֵנוּ *our teacher*, Job xxxv. 11, for מְאַלְּפֵנוּ, by Art. 79. And, Jer. xv. 10, מְקַלְלֻנִי *cursing me*,

where we have in the margin, מְחַלְלָנִי, which is probably the true reading, giving the participle or concrete verbal noun, written with the vowels proper for a verb with the fragment of the first personal pronoun.

8th, In the participle of the feminine gender, (ֽ) occasionally remains: as, מְשַׁכֶּלֶת *causing abortion*, Exod. xxiii. 26; we also have מְשַׁכֶּרֶת *inebriating*, Jer. li. 7; and, without *Dāgésh*, מְנָאֶפֶת (for מְנַאֶפֶת) *committing adultery*, Prov. xxx. 20; and, by contraction, מְשָׁרֶת (for מְשָׁרֶתֶת) *ministering*, 1 Kings i. 15 (Art. 82.).

9th, For the force of this species, see Art. 162. 7—9.

On the Passive Voice.

10th, We sometimes have (ֽ) *Khātúph* in this species, instead of (ַ), e. g. גָּדַת *it was cut*, Ezek. xvi. 4; where it should be observed, that ד receives *Dāgésh*, contrary to the usual practice: שְׁדֻדָה *it is destroyed*, Nah. iii. 7. So, also, מְאָדָם *made red*, Ib. ii. 4; and, in the plural number, מְאָדָמִים,* Exod. xxv. 5.

11th, In many instances, the *Dāgésh* is implied (Art. 115.): as, רָחַץ *wasted*, Prov. xxx. 12; רֻחָמָה *object of mercy*, fem., Hos. i. 6. The *Kāméts* found here in the penultima is on account of the pause-accent (Art. 127. 4.). So, נֻחָמָה *consoled*, Is. liv. 11.

12th, When *Dāgésh* is neither *written* nor *implied*, the preceding vowel is necessarily made perfect: as, הֹרָג *slain*, Is. xxvii. 7; טֹרָף *torn*, Gen. xliv. 28; פֹּרָשׁ *declared, revealed*, Num. xv. 34; סֹעָרָה *agitated*, (as with a whirlwind), Is. liv. 11. In all which cases the correspondence of the vowels is oblique (Art. 102. 2.).

13th, In some other instances the correspondence is direct: as, יוּלָד *born*, Judg. xiii. 8; יוּקָשִׁים *taken in a net*, Eccles. ix. 12: מוּעָדֶת *out of joint*, Prov. xxv. 19. In the first two examples *Dāgésh* is perhaps euphonic; in the last, *Kāméts* is put for *Sēgól* on account of the pause (Art. 127. 5.). But here the Grammarians differ, according to Kimchi, whether these are nouns or participles. In Jer. xxii. 23, we have this participial noun, with several others, so combined with the

---

* In some of the editions, and as cited by Buxtorf, this word is written מְאֻדָּם and מְאֻדָּמִים, with *Kāméts Khātéf* under א, which is contrary to the first principles of Hebrew syllabication. They are thus also cited by Kimchi, in the *Mikhlol*, from which Buxtorf probably took his examples.

feminine pronoun of the second person singular, as to have given considerable uneasiness to the Grammarians: the passage is,—

יֹשַׁבְתִּי בַּלְּבָנוֹן מְקֻנַּנְתִּי בָּאֲרָזִים מַה־נֶּחְנַתְּי בְּבֹא־לָךְ חֲבָלִים

Thou (who) *dwellest in the Libanus, art nestled in the cedars, how shalt thou be consoled when pains come upon thee?*

Here יֹשַׁבְתִּי is put for יֹשֶׁבֶת אַתְּי, מְקֻנַּנְתִּי for מְקֻנָּן אַתְּי, and נֶחְנַתְּי for נֶחְנָן אַתְּי. In all which cases, we have nothing more than the feminine form of the pronoun in conjunction with a participial, or verbal concrete, noun. In the example מְקֻנַּנְתִּי, Rabbi Jona was of opinion, according to Buxtorf, that some of the vowels only had been retrenched: by which he probably meant, that the pronoun was added, some abbreviation being also made (See Art. 186. note.).

14th, In a few instances we have a substitute of *Shĕvá*, where analogy requires *Shĕvá*, which seems to have been introduced merely for the sake of euphony: as, לָקֳחָה *taken*, Gen. ii. 23; תִּבָּקְשִׁי *thou shalt be sought*, Ezek. xxvi. 21 (Art. 112. 5.).

15th, For the force of this Species, see Artt. 162. 7—9. 16.

208. *Paradigm of the Conjugation of the Fifth and Sixth Species*, i. e. *in both the Active and Passive Voices*, Hiphḥil *and* Hophḥal.

PRETERITE TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
3	הִפְקִיד	הִפְקִידָה	הִפְקִידוּ	הִפְקִידוּ
2	הִפְקַדְתָּ	הִפְקַדְתְּ	הִפְקַדְתֶּם	הִפְקַדְתֶּן
1	הִפְקַדְתִּי	הִפְקַדְתִּי	הִפְקַדְנוּ	הִפְקַדְנוּ

PRESENT TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	יַפְקִיד	תַּפְקִיד	יַפְקִידוּ	תַּפְקֵדְנָה
2	תַּפְקִיד	תַּפְקִידִי	תַּפְקִידוּ	תַּפְקֵדְנָה
1	אַפְקִיד	אַפְקִיד	נַפְקִיד	נַפְקִיד

IMPERATIVE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
	Mas.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
2	הַפְקֵד	הַפְקִידִי	הַפְקִידוּ	הַפְקֵדְנָה

INFINITIVE, *or* Abstract Verbal Noun.

Masc. Forms.	Fem. Forms.
הַפְקֵד or הַפְקִיד	הַפְקֶדֶת, הַפְקָדָה, הַפְקֻדוּת

PARTICIPIAL, *or* Concrete Verbal, Noun.

Singular.		Plural.	
Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
מַפְקִיד	מַפְקִידָה or מַפְקֶדֶת	מַפְקִידִים	מַפְקִידוֹת

Passive Voice, Hophḥal.

PRETERITE TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	הָפְקַד	הָפְקְדָה	הָפְקְדוּ	הָפְקְדוּ
2	הָפְקַדְתָּ	הָפְקַדְתְּ	הָפְקַדְתֶּם	הָפְקַדְתֶּן
1	הָפְקַדְתִּי	הָפְקַדְתִּי	הָפְקַדְנוּ	הָפְקַדְנוּ

PRESENT TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	יָפְקַד	תָּפְקַד	יָפְקְדוּ	תָּפְקַדְנָה
2	תָּפְקַד	תָּפְקְדִי	תָּפְקְדוּ	תָּפְקַדְנָה
1	אָפְקַד	אָפְקַד	נָפְקַד	נָפְקַד

IMPERATIVE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
Pers.	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
2	הָפְקֵד	הָפְקְדִי	הָפְקְדוּ	הָפְקֵדְנָה

INFINITIVE.

הָפְקֵד ,הָפְקֵד ,הָפְקֵד

PARTICIPIAL, *or* Concrete Verbal Nouns.

Singular.		Plural.	
מָפְקֵד	מְפֻקֶדֶה מְפֻקֶדֶת	מְפֻקָדִים	מְפֻקָדוֹת

On the Active Voice.

2d, The characteristic ה of this species occurs also with (ֵ), (ֶ), or (ַ), but this happens only when a guttural letter follows: as, הֶאֱמִין *he believed*, Gen. xlv. 26; הֶעֱמִיד *he caused to stand*, Lev. xiv. 11; הֶאֱמַרְתָּ *thou hast professed*, Deut. xxvi. 17; הֶעֱבַרְתָּ *thou hast caused to pass over*, Josh. vii. 7. We also have הַעֲבַרְתָּ Exod. xiii. 12, and הֶעֱבַרְתִּי Zech. iii. 4, &c. And with (ִ) under the guttural in הֶחְתִּים *it is obstructed*, Lev. xv. 3.

3d, In one instance we have (ְ) with the middle radical letter: as, הִשְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ *I have requested him*, 1 Sam. i. 28. See the notes on *Kal* (Art. 201. 27.).

4th, On the word הֶחֱדַלְתִּי *shall I leave?* Judg. ix. 9, 11, 13, much has been written, and, as I think, not very conclusively. But let us endeavour to resolve it. It will be seen, by turning to the lexicons, that חֲדַל is the form of the Imperative in *Kal*: which, according to our system, will give חֹדֶל, for the primitive Segolate noun. Here, then, we have, perhaps, nothing more than this Segolate noun, instead of one of the other primitives, conjugated with the pronoun, which in the first person will regularly be חֹדַלְתִּי,

and, by rejecting the *Khōlém* (as in the Segolates, Art. 160. 3.), and retaining the correspondent substitute of *Shĕvá*, in order to preserve the form, we shall have חָדַלְתִּי, which, with the interrogative הֲ prefixed (Art. 192. 8.), we shall have הֲחָדַלְתִּי *am I a leaving?* i. e. *shall I leave?* According to this analysis, therefore, this word belongs not to the fifth, but to the first species, conjugated, however, with the abstract, instead of the concrete, noun, which is unusual.

5th, In another instance, viz. אֲנָאַלְתִּי *I have polluted*, Is. lxiii. 3, we have the augmented verbal noun commencing with א instead of ה: i. e. the form usually taken in the Chaldee and Syriac (Art. 165. 2. 168. 2.).

6th, Again, we have, in Amos iv. 3, הִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה, which I take to be an unusual, though a more regular, way of writing the second person plural feminine of the preterite tense: i. e. הַשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה, usually תִּשְׁלַכְתֶּן (Art. 201. 26.), *ye have cast*. In Isaiah also, chap. xix. 6, we have הֶאֱזְנִיחוּ *they shall abhor*, with two letters of augmentation, א and ה, added for the purpose, perhaps, of giving the greater emphasis.

7th, In the present tense we also have the form תַּפְקֵד: and in both, י is frequently omitted. With the paragogic ה, however, י is always added: as, אַשְׁלִיכָה *I will cast*, Nehem. xiii. 8. With (··): as, יַאֲמֵן *he may believe*, Job xv. 31. And, by a further contraction, יַבְטַח *he will give confidence*, 2 Kings xviii. 30, for יַבְטֵחַ or יַבְטִיחַ.

8th, In some instances every trace of the characteristic י is lost: as, יָדְבְּקוּ *they arrived at*, 1 Sam. xxxi. 2; יִדְרְכוּ *they bend* or *tread as a bow*, Jer. ix. 2. Where the primitive form seems to have been taken, instead of the usual one of the measure פִּקֵּיד.

9th, אֹסֵף *I will collect*, 1 Sam. xv. 6, is put for אוֹסִיף (for אַוְסִיף Artt. 78. 93.), root יסף or וסף. So, אֹבֵדָה *I will ruin*, Jer. xlvi. 8 (for אוֹבִידָה Ib. for אַוְבִידָה), root ובד, Arabic وَبَدَ, cognate with אָבַד.

10th, א is sometimes rejected together with the characteristic ה, to facilitate the pronunciation perhaps: as, אָזֹן *I will hear*, Job xxxii. 11 (for אַאֲזִין Art. 93. 5.). So, אַסִּיפֵם *I will destroy them*, Jer. viii. 13, for אַאַסִּיפֵם; יַחַל *he shall pitch a tent*, for יַאֲחַל, Isa. xiii. 20; יוֹחַר *he tarries*, 2 Sam. xx. 5, is perhaps for the passive form יָאֻחַר, for יְאֻחָר (Art. 79.), and, as the quiescence of א after

Kāméts Khātúf is rather unusual in constituting a syllable in Hebrew, the וֹ may have been taken in order to avoid that concurrence. The final (ּ) may also be euphonic, and taken on account of the guttural, as in other cases.

11th, Some are of opinion, that וַיִּרְבּ 1 Sam. xv. 5, is put for וַיַּאְרְבּ by omitting the א, as above, by Art. 93. 5.

12th, In the Imperative we may have a paragogic ה, which will then, as before, (No. 7.) take the characteristic י: as, הַצְלִיחָה *prosper thou*, Neh. i. 11.

13th, Whenever the second or third radical letter is either a guttural or ר, the terminating vowel will be (-): as, הַנְחַת *cause to come down*, Joel iv. 11; הַרְחַק *remove far away*, Job xiii. 21; הַוְשַׁר, margin הַיְשַׁר *make straight*, Ps. v. 9.

14th, In the Infinitive or abstract verbal noun, the characteristic ת has (-) for the most part: as, הַכְרִית *cutting off*, Jer. xliv. 8; הַזְכִּיר *commemorating*, 2 Sam. xviii. 18. When any one of the particles contained in the word בכלם is prefixed, this form is always adopted: when this is not the case, we may have הַפְקֵד, or הַפְקִיד: as, הַשְׁכֵּם *rising early*, Jer. vii. 13; הָעֲמִיד *setting up*, Neh. vii. 3; הַשְׁמִיד *destroying*, Amos ix. 8.

15th, When either the second or third letter is a guttural, or ר, we then have (-) for the final vowel, as before: as, הַפְצֵר *resisting*, 1 Sam. xv. 23; הַזְכַּרְכֶם *your bringing to recollection*, Ezek. xxi. 29.

16th, In many instances, we have the first vowel of the Infinitive the same with that of the Preterite tense: as, הַרְגִּיעַ *giving rest;* הַרְגִּיז *shaking*, Jer. l. 34: הַמְלִיט *liberating;* הַאֲיִל *saving*, Isa. xxxi. 5.

17th, לַאֲדִיב 1 Sam. ii. 33, is probably put for לְהַאֲדִיב (Art. 79.), derived from the root אָדַב; אָדַב *he punished.* Whence תֹּאדֵב *correction, punishment.* See Eichhorn's edition of the Lexicon of Simonis, sub voce אדב.

On the Passive Voice HOPHḤAL.

18th, This voice, it will be seen, is grounded on nouns of the form of הָפְקֵד or הָפְקֵד (Art. 165. 10.). And here, as in *Pūḥál*, the

agent never appears, and hence, both are called by the Hebrew Grammarians, as are also those corresponding to them in Arabic by the Arabians, Conjugations the agents of which are not named.*

19th, With *Kibbúts* accompanying ה, instead of (ָ) *Khātúph:* as, הֻשְׁכַּב *thrown down*, Ezek. xxxii. 32; הֻשְׁלַךְ *cast down*, Dan. viii. 11.

20th, When the first radical letter happens to be a guttural, (ֲ) occupies the place of *Shĕvá:* as, הֶחֳרְבָה *she is laid waste*, Ezek. xxvi. 2, where *Kāméts Khātúph* becomes a perfect vowel, and remains under the characteristic ה by analogy (See Art. 58.).

21st, The participial nouns frequently occur with (ְ) instead of (ָ) *Khātúph:* as, מֻשְׁכָּב *laid down*, 2 Kings iv. 32. So in the feminine, מֻשְׁלֶכֶת *cast down*, 1 Kings xiii. 25. In one instance, the characteristic ה is retained, as it is often the case in the Chaldee: as, מְהֻקְצָעוֹת (for מְהֻקָּצוֹת) *made angular*, Ezek. xlvi. 22. But, when the first radical is a guttural, it will take (ֲ), as before: e. g. מֻעֱמָד *set up*, 1 Kings xxii. 35: מֻאֱחָזִים *contained, held*, 2 Chron. ix. 18; מֻחֱרָבוֹת *wasted*, Ezek. xxix. 12. So יֻחֲרַם (who is) *forbidden*, Exod. xxii. 19.

22d, The characteristic ה of this and the preceding species, is generally rejected when preceded by any preformative taking an initial *Shĕvá:* as, יֻקְיַד for יֻהְקְיַד; יֻקָּד for יֻהְקַּד, &c. See Art. 79.

23d, For the peculiar force of this species, both active and passive, see Art. 165. 2—10.

---

* Heb. בִּנְיָן שֶׁלֹּא נִזְכַּר שֵׁם פֹּעֲלוֹ, Arab. صِيغَةٌ مَا لَمْ يُسَمَّ فَاعِلُهُ

The reason of this seems to be, that, as the nominative is included in the verb, and, as in these passive conjugations, this nominative is not the agent, but the patient on which the influence of the verb is exerted, if any other word is added as a nominative, (which will then be in apposition with the pronoun so included) it will not represent the agent, but the *patient:* and, further, as it is unusual in the Shemitic dialects to use a periphrasis: as, *Judah was killed by Simeon;* for then, it would be shorter to say, *Simeon killed Judah*, the Grammarians have laid this apparent omission down as a rule, although some instances are to be found to the contrary.

209. *Paradigm of the Conjugation of the Seventh Species termed* HITHPAHEL.

PRETERITE TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
3	הִתְפַּקֵּד	הִתְפַּקְּדָה	הִתְפַּקְּדוּ	הִתְפַּקַּדְנָה
2	הִתְפַּקַּדְתָּ	הִתְפַּקַּדְתְּ	הִתְפַּקַּדְתֶּם	הִתְפַּקַּדְתֶּן
1	הִתְפַּקַּדְתִּי	הִתְפַּקַּדְתִּי	הִתְפַּקַּדְנוּ	הִתְפַּקַּדְנוּ

PRESENT TENSE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
3	יִתְפַּקֵּד	תִּתְפַּקֵּד	יִתְפַּקְּדוּ	תִּתְפַּקַּדְנָה
2	תִּתְפַּקֵּד	תִּתְפַּקְּדִי	תִּתְפַּקְּדוּ	תִּתְפַּקַּדְנָה
1	אֶתְפַּקֵּד	אֶתְפַּקֵּד	נִתְפַּקֵּד	נִתְפַּקֵּד

IMPERATIVE.

	Singular.		Plural.	
2	הִתְפַּקֵּד	הִתְפַּקְּדִי	הִתְפַּקְּדוּ	הִתְפַּקַּדְנָה

INFINITIVE.

הִתְפַּקֵּד

PARTICIPIAL NOUNS.

Singular.		Plural.	
מִתְפַּקֵּד	מִתְפַּקְּדָה or מִתְפַּקֶּדֶת	מִתְפַּקְּדִים	מִתְפַּקְּדוֹת

2d, Of the passive form of this species, only a few instances occur: as, הָתְפָּקְדוּ *they were set in order, arranged,* Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62, 1 Kings xx. 27. In our authorized version, this word is

translated by *numbered*, for which there does not seem to be any good authority. For some account of (ר) instead of (־) under the first radical letter, see Art. 198. 4. 5.

Other examples are: חֻטְמָאָה *polluted* (for חֻטַּמְאָה, where ט and ת combine under ט), Deut. xxiv. 4; and חֻדְּשָׁנָה *made fat*, Isa. xxxiv. 6, for חֻתְדַּשְׁנָה Art. 89. 2.

On the Seventh Species termed HITHPAḤEL.

3d, The last vowel in both tenses, as well as in the Imperative, is frequently (־): as, הִתְחַזַּק *he seemed strong*, 2 Chron. xiii. 7: יִתְגַּלַּח *he shall be shaved*,* Lev. xiii. 33, and, with the Chaldaic prefix אֶתְחַבַּר *he joined himself*, 2 Chron. xx. 35. So in the present tense, אֶתְנֶחָם *I will console myself*, Ps. cxix. 52 (the primitive word being נָחַם, not נֶחָם); תִּתְהַדַּר *thou arrogatest praise to thyself*, Prov. xxv. 6; תִּתַּמָּם *thou shewest thyself perfect*, Ib. et Ps. xviii. 26; תִּתְפַּתָּל *thou shewest thyself perverse*, 2 Sam. xxii. 27. See Ps. xxxvii. 4, and 1 Kings xx. 22, for the Imperative. Here the primitive word seems to have had (־) for its last vowel.

4th, In נִכַּפֵּר *he shall be expiated*, Deut. xxi. 8, it has been thought, that we have a contracted form for נִתְכַּפֵּר, a compound of both the *Hithpāḥél*, and *Niphḥál*, species. To which I see no reason for objection; because I hold, that the augment of the *Niphḥál* species may be prefixed to a noun commencing with ת, with just as much propriety as it can do to any other. The Rabbinical writers, it may be remarked, often use this form.

5th, Any root, having for its medial radical a letter incapable of receiving *Dāgésh*, will make the usual compensation (See Art. 115.). The verb here also, as in other instances, may have the paragogic ה (See Art. 184. 3.).

6th, In a few instances, (·) attends the medial radical letter: as, הִתְקַדַּשְׁתִּי *I will shew myself to be holy*; הִתְגַּדַּלְתִּי *I will shew myself to be great*, Ezek. xxxviii. 23 (See Lev. xi. 44.). We have also *Khōlém*: as, הִתְגֹּעֲשׁוּ *they shall be moved*; הִתְהֹלָלוּ *they shall be made mad*, Jer. xxv. 16. The primitive nouns here are perhaps

---

* The future signification of this tense will be accounted for in the Syntax.

חָדִישׁ, גָּהַל, גָּעַשׁ, and הָלַל, which will account sufficiently for the forms.

7th, In the participial noun we have מְנָאָץ *irritated*, Isa. lii. 5, for מִתְנָאֵץ, where the primitive noun is of the form פָּקָד.

8th, The feminine form has sometimes a segolate termination: as, מִתְאַמֶּצֶת *strengthening herself*, Ruth i. 18; מִתְלַקְּחַת *contained*, Exod. ix. 24.

9th, In Exod. ii. 4: וַתִּתְיַצַּב *and she stood*, we have a very singular anomaly, and one which has given great trouble to the Grammarians, among whom Albert Schultens seems to me to have approached nearest to the truth. His solution of the difficulty is:—"It is not only," says he, "in the sibilants that a transposition might take place (Art. 89. 2. 3.), but also in any other letter, as in the Arabic species اِنْفَعَلَ. If then we take יָצַב for the root, and write תִּיתַצַּב for תִּתְיַצַּב, and then drop the י (Art. 78.) we shall have תִּתַּצַּב, which will be sufficiently analogical. Alting refers the form to a Syriasm. Heb. Gram. §. 163.

10th, For the properties of this species, see Art. 165. 12—16; and for the transpositions which sometimes take place in the letters, Art. 89.

Of the remaining and less usual Species of the Conjugation of Hebrew Verbs.

210. Of these, the forms פּוֹדֵד, פֹּדַד, and הִתְפּוֹדֵד classed under the third, fourth, and seventh species (Art. 199.), will be considered when we come to treat on those roots which have ו or י for their middle radical; or, have the second and third the same: because those verbs alone are subject to these forms.

2d, It must have appeared, from what has already been said, that, although the roots or words to be conjugated may be multiform, the conjugation is but one: that is to say, the different persons, &c. are formed in all cases by one general and regular process. The persons, for example, are formed, either by prefixing, or postfixing, the defective forms of one or other of the

pronouns (Artt. 201. 202.). The Imperative and Infinitive, by taking the root, and suffixing the pronouns or not; and the participles, by prefixing מ, which then may be inflected like other nouns. The following examples, taken from the Mikhlol of D. Kimchi, will sufficiently illustrate this subject, as applied to pluriliteral roots.

כִּרְבֵּל *he put on a certain garment.*

PRETERITE TENSE.

3 pers. כִּרְבֵּל; 2 כִּרְבַּלְתָּ; 1 כִּרְבַּלְתִּי, &c. as before.

PRESENT TENSE.

3 pers. יְכַרְבֵּל; 2 תְּכַרְבֵּל; 1 אֲכַרְבֵּל, &c.

ACTIVE PARTICIPIAL NOUN.

Masc. מְכַרְבֵּל, fem. מְכַרְבְּלָה or מְכַרְבֶּלֶת, sing.; masc. מְכַרְבְּלִים, fem. מְכַרְבְּלוֹת, pl.

PASSIVE PARTICIPIAL NOUN.

מְכֹרְבָּל, &c., 1 Chron. xv. 27.

3d, In the same manner may be conjugated כִּרְסֵם *he cut off;* רִטְפֵּשׁ *he was full of moisture;* פִּרְשֵׂז *he spread;* חִרְחֵר *he undermined;* חַרְחַר *he inflamed*, &c., which are nothing more than reduplicated nouns. See Art. 177.

4th, From the noun תַּחְתֶּרֶת *a breast-plate*, we have תְּתַחְתֵּרֶת *thou puttest on a breast-plate*, Jer. xii. 5. And as a participle, מְתַחְתֶּרֶת Ib. xxii. 15.

5th, Of primitive words dropping the medial ו or י, and reduplicating the first and last radical letters (Art. 177. 5.), the following are given as the leading persons of verbs: כִּלְכֵּל *sustaining;* כִּרְכֵּר *leaping;* סִכְסֵךְ *arming;* צִפְצֵף *chirping;* חִרְחֵר (rather חַרְחַר, as above), *undermining*. Many of these, however, are placed by other Grammarians under roots having the second and third radicals the

same. In one instance we have a passive form, כָּלְכְּלוּ *were sustained*, 1 Kings xx. 27.

6th, The following are supposed by Kimchi to have been formed by reduplicating the first and second letter of the root (Art. 177. 3.): as, שִׁגְשֵׁג *causing to increase;* שְׁעֲשַׁע *soothing, delighting;* תַּעְתֵּעַ *ridiculing*. Whence מְתַעְתֵּעַ Gen. xxvii. 12; יָפְיָפִיתָ *thou art exceedingly beautiful*, Ps. xlv. 3; טֵאמֵא *sweeping, overwhelming:*

7th,—These, by reduplicating the last two, and dropping the first, radical: חֲפַכְפֵּךְ *turning about, tortuous;* חָמַרְמַר *becoming very hot;* סְחַרְחַר *perambulatory* (see Art. 177. 6.): and the following, by also prefixing the particle הִת: as, הִתְמַהְמָה *delaying*.

8th, All these, as far as they are found conjugated, follow the general analogy already laid down: e. g. סְכַכְתִּי *I* (will) *arm*, Is. xix. 2; יְסַכְסֵךְ *he will arm*, Ib. ix. 10. From תְּשַׁגְשְׁגִי, שִׁגְשֵׁג *thou* (fem.) *causest to grow*, Isa. xvii. 11. So הִתְמַהְמָה *he delayed;* הִתְמַהְמְהוּ *they delayed*, Judg. xix. 8; הִתְמַהְמָהְנוּ *we delayed*, Gen. xliii. 10. Infinitive, הִתְמַהְמֵהַּ *delaying*, Exod. xii. 39. Participle, מִתְמַהְמֵהַּ, *It.* יִתְמַהְמֵהַּ *he will, may*, &c. *delay*, Hab. ii. 3.

In the last instance, the final ה is radical, and therefore it has the *Mappik*, and remains unchangeable, of which more will be said hereafter.

9th, It should be observed, that these verbs are found in a very few of the persons at most, some only as participles or verbal nouns; and, in no case, perhaps, is any verb found conjugated throughout all the species.

LECTURE XII.

ON THE DEFECTIVE VERBS.

211. Having given tables of the verbs whether simple or augmented, and explained some occasional anomalies, as they have been called, we now proceed to consider those verbs which seem to present some further irregularities.

2d, It has already been shewn, that primitive words having a נ in certain situations (Art. 82.), or either of the letters אהוי (Art. 78. &c.), may occasionally drop it; and that one of the two last radical letters of any word, when both are the same, may also be rejected. We may now remark, that when words thus circumstanced are conjugated with the pronouns, they will be affected, both in their vowels and consonants, in these particulars. We do not think it necessary here to divide these verbs into *Defectives* and *Quiescents*, as is usually the case; because that would, perhaps, be multiplying distinctions, without sufficient reasons for doing so.

3d, All the anomalies or defects, then, that can possibly occur, must arise from having one or more of these letters as the first, second, or third, radical letter of the root; or, when the second and third radicals are the same.

4th, Let us begin with those commencing with נ. The rule is (Art. 82.), to this effect: Whenever נ is affected with a final *Shĕvá* (ְ), it must be dropped: i. e. whenever the פ in פָּקַד of our paradigm has a final *Shĕvá*, then, putting any verb commencing with

נ in the same situation, the נ will be rejected, and the defect supplied by *Dāgésh forte.*

5th, All verbs of this kind, therefore, will be conjugated regularly in the Preterite tense of *Kal:* as, נָגַשׁ *he approached;* נָגַשְׁתָּ, נָגַשְׁתְּ, נָגַשְׁתִּי, &c., as also in the *Pīḥél, Pūḥál,* and *Hithpāḥél,* throughout.

In the Present tense, the leading word is נִגַּשׁ; here, then, we shall have יִנְגַּשׁ, but by Art. 82. יִגַּשׁ, תִּגַּשׁ, תִּגְּשִׁי, אֶגַּשׁ, &c.

6th, In the same manner in the preterite of *Niphḥál,* נִגַּשׁ, for נִנְגַּשׁ; and so on, by the same rule, through the *Hiphḥíl* and *Hophḥál* species.

7th, The Infinitive, or abstract verbal noun, is, for the most part, of the form פִּקֶדֶת; as, נִגֶּשֶׁת, and, dropping the נ (Art. 82.), גֶּשֶׁת; but, if a guttural be the last radical letter, (ַ_ַ) will become (ַ_), as it is the case with segolate nouns (Art. 114.).

8th, The Imperative is גַּשׁ for נְגַשׁ, which is regularly conjugated: as, גַּשׁ, גְּשִׁי, גְּשׁוּ, גַּשְׁנָה. It will not be necessary to notice this verb farther.

9th, As the verb נָתַן *he gave, placed,* &c. has a little peculiarity about it, in having ן also for its final letter, it will be necessary briefly to notice its conjugation.

10th, Here, then, the final ן will also be rejected by our rule (Art. 82.), whenever that has a final *Shĕvá:* as, נָתַתָּ, for נָתַנְתָּ, &c. And, as יִתֵּן is the leading word for the present tense, we shall have regularly, יִתֵּן, יִנְתֵּן, תִּנְתֵּן, &c.; but, by our rule, יִתֵּן, תִּתֵּן, &c. This, however, does not always take place in other verbs ending in ן.

11th, In the Infinitive, for נִתְּנֶת, or תִּתֶּנֶת, according to our last example, we have תֵּת, by a further contraction, as if תֶּנֶת or תִּתֶּנֶת had been the primitive form; and hence, with the affixed pronouns, תִּתִּי *my giving;* תִּתּוֹ *his giving,* &c.

12th, In these, as in other verbs, we may have (-), (ֵ), or (ֶ), for the last vowel of either of the tenses: hence תִּגֹּשׁ *thou shalt exact,*

Deut. xv. 3; יִבּוֹל *it shall fall, wither*, Ps. i. 3; the primitive being, perhaps, נְבֹשׁ, and נְבוֹל respectively.

13th, When the second radical letter is either a guttural, or ר, and therefore incapable of receiving *Dāgésh*, the compensation, when נ is dropped, is either *expressed*, or *implied* (Art. 115.); as, first, יֵחַת, for יִנְחַת (for יִנְחַת) *he will descend;* second, נִחַם, for נִנְחַם, of נִנְחַם *he will receive consolation.*

14th, In some cases, when the middle radical is a guttural, the נ is not dropped: as, יִנְאַק *he groans;* יִנְהַם *he rages;* יִנְחַל *he will possess;* יִנְעַם *he is mild.* There are also a few instances in which the נ is retained, when the second radical is not guttural: as, יִנְטֹר *he will keep*, Jer. iii. 5; תִּנְבְּשׁוּ *ye will exact*, Is. lviii. 3, &c.

15th, The נ is also occasionally preserved in the Infinitive: as, נִבֹּל *withering;* נִגַּע *touching:* also in the Imperative; as, נְטֹשׁ *leave;* נְצֹר *keep;* נְקֹר *dig;* נְטַע *plant*, &c.

16th, As one verb commencing with ל, namely, לָקַח *he took*, is subject, in some degree, to the same rule, it may be proper to notice it in this place.

This verb, then, is found in the species *Kal*, *Niphhál*, and *Pūhál* only. In *Kal*, the ל is dropped, whenever it is accompanied by a final (ּ), as also in the Imperative, and occasionally in the Infinitive. In the preterite tense, therefore, it will retain all its letters, like פָּקַד. In the present, we shall have יִקַּח, for יִלְקַח; and so on. In the Imperative we have קַח and לְקַח, חֲזִי and לְחֲזִי, &c. In the Infinitive, we have two forms, קַחַת (once חֲחַת 2 Kings xii. 9.), and לָקוֹחַ, Deut. xxxi. 26.

17th, In *Niphhál* the ל is retained: as, נִלְקַח and נִלְקְחָה *it is taken*, 1 Sam. iv. 11, 17, 22. Infinitive, הִלָּקַח *being taken*, Ib. 19, 21.

18th, In *Pūhál* we have לֻקַּח in the preterite, and יֻקַּח, for יִלֻּקַח, in the present. But in the third person singular feminine of the preterite, לֻקְּחַת (for לֻקְחָה) Gen. ii. 23, which has probably been effected by attraction.

19th, The participles are regular as far as they are found: as, לוֹקֵחַ *one who takes, &c.*

On the Verbs commencing with א *or* י.

212. The next class of roots we shall notice, as being subject to certain defects, are those having א or י for their first radical letter.

2d, Now, as these letters being the first of any word will lose their consonantal power, only when preceded by certain vowels (Art. 43.), the consequence is, the conjugation will be regular as in פָּקַד, in the preterite of *Kal*, the Infinitive and Participles; as also in the whole of *Pīḥél*, *Pūḥál*, and *Hithpāḥél*; but, in this last, they seldom occur. We need not therefore give any table of these forms. Let us now proceed to consider those parts in which any defect or contraction arises, in consequence of either of these letters losing their consonantal powers; and, first, of those which have א for the first radical.

3d, The leading word for the preterite tense of *Kal* may be either of the forms פָּקַד or פָּקֹד: as, אָמַר *he said*; אוֹר *he shone* (for אָוַר perhaps, Art. 81.); that of the present of either פִּקֵּד, פְּקֵד, or פָּקֵד, and rarely פָּקֵד: as, אֹמַר (for אֶאְמַר Art. 93. 5.) *I say*; אֹזֵר *binding*; תֹּאזֵר *thou bindest*; תֹּאנַף *thou art angry*; יֹאתֶה *he comes*. A few have two forms: as, אֶחֱז and אֹחֵז; אֹמַר and אֹמֵר.

In one case, we have פְּקוּד: as, אֲנוּשׁ; and, in a few we have *Páthakh*: as, אָנוּשָׁה, contr. for אַאֲנוּשָׁה *I am languid*, Ps. lxix. 21; אֹמַר &c.

4th, Taking אֹמֵר, then, or any other of these leading words, and prefixing the abbreviated pronouns with (ּ), we shall have אֶאְמַר, תֹּאמַר, תֹּאמְרִי, יֹאמַר *he, she, thou, I, speak*, &c.: but, by contraction, (Art. 93. 5.), יֹאמַר, תֹּאמַר, תֹּאמְרִי, אֹמַר; and, without the accent, יֹאמַר, תֹּאמַר, &c.; also with (־), יֹאמַר, תֹּאמַר, &c.; or, with א omitted, יֹמַר, תֹּמַר, &c.; אָחַז *he held*, has יֹאחֵז and יֹאחַז, תֹּאחֵז and תֹּאחַז, &c.; many other verbs also, of this kind, have two forms in the present tense.

5th, In the Imperative אֱמֹר, אִמְרִי, &c. the Infinitive is אָמֹר or אֱמֹר; the participle active אֹמֵר, plural אֹמְרִים, &c. as in פֹּקֵד. So in the Passive Participle, אָמוּר.

6th, In *Niphḥál* the initial א is treated like any other guttural: as, נֶאֱמַר, נֶאֱמְרָה, נֶאֱמַרְתָּ, &c.; and, in the present tense, וְאֵמַר, תֵּאָמֵרִי, &c.; אָחַז has in this species, נֶאֱחַז, (for נְאֶחַז Art. 93. 5.), plural נֶאֱחֲזוּ *they are taken,* Josh. xxii. 9; the leading word taken here being similar to that in the present tense of *Kal.* The participle is regular, נֶאֱמָר, נֶאֱחָז, &c.

7th, In *Hiphḥíl* and *Hophḥál,* the same rule prevails: as, הֶאֱמִין *he believed;* הֶאֱמִינָה, הֶאֱמַנְתָּ, הֶאֱמַנְתִּי, הֶאֱמִינוּ, &c. Present tense, יַאֲמִין, תַּאֲמִין, אַאֲמִין, &c.; or, with the י omitted, יַאֲמֵן, תַּאֲמֵן, the defect being supplied by (ֵ).

8th, So in the Participial noun, מַאֲמִין, fem. מַאֲמִינָה, pl. מַאֲמִינִים, &c.

9th, In a few instances the radical א is dropped: as, הָכִיל *consuming,* for הַאֲכִיל, where there is also a contraction of the vowels (Art. 93. 5.), Ezek. xxi. 33. So יָרֵב, for יַאֲרֵב *he lies in wait,* 1 Sam. xv. 5; אָזִין *I will hear,* for אַאֲזִין, Job xxxii. 11; אָסֵף for אַאֲסֵף *I will collect,* Zeph. i. 2, 3; אָרִיצֵנּוּ for אַאֲרִיצֵנּוּ *I will depress him,* Jer. xlix. 19; to which several other of the same kind may be added. So in the participle מֵזִין for מֵאֲזִין *hearkening,* Prov. xvii. 4.

10th, In *Hophḥál,* מָאֳחָזִים *things* or *persons held, contained,* or the like, 2 Chron. ix. 18, is according to analogy.

11th, Enough has perhaps been said, to shew what the process of conjugating these verbs is: we may now proceed, therefore, to those which have י for their first radical.

213. One remarkable circumstance attends these verbs, which is this: There seems to be considerable difficulty in ascertaining whether ו or י has the greater claim to be the first letter of these roots. This is also the case in the Arabic; and, from the frequent substitution of one for the other in the Hebrew, the same difficulty must have long

existed in this language.* We shall, therefore, in considering the conjugations, take it for granted, that the primitive forms were occasionally written with ו or י; and, that one or other of these letters has been occasionally taken as the most convenient for enunciation, when preceded by some vowel depriving it of its consonantal power.

On the KAL, PIḤEL, PUḤAL, *and* HITHPAḤEL *Species of Verbs commencing with* י.

2d, In *Pīḥél*, *Pūḥál*, and *Hithpāḥél*, as before, we have no defect, which is also the case in the preterite of *Kal*. In the Infinitive, Imperative, and Present tense of *Kal*, and in the *Niphḥál*, *Hiphḥíl*, and *Hophḥál* species, therefore, our only defects will occur; and these we now proceed to detail.

3d, In the Present tense of *Kal*, then, as in former cases, the last vowel of the root may be either (-), (ֵ), or (ִ), which may be accounted for in every case, by supposing a different form of the primitive word to have been originally taken. So far all is as before.†

4th, In the next place, when the preformatives are brought in contact with י, two modes of adjustment will take place among the vowels and consonants; the one by contraction, and occasional omission also: the other by a sort of accommodation and omission: e. g. 1st. יָבֵשׁ *becoming dry*; present יִיְבַשׁ, contracted by Art. 93. 5. יִיְבַשׁ; and by omission, יִבַשׁ, where (ִ) is a *perfect* vowel by analogy. So יִירַשׁ *he will possess*; אִישַׁן *I shall sleep*; יִיקַץ *he will awake*; יִישֵׂם *he will place*; יִיצֵר *he will form*.

5th, The second method is, by contracting the (ִ) and (ֵ) into (ֵ), and omitting the radical י: as, יֵשֵׁב, for יִישֵׁב *he will dwell*; אֵלֵךְ *I*

---

* Thus we now have וֹרֵד for יֹרֵד *descending*, 1 Sam. xxx. 24; וָלָד *progeny*, Gen. xi. 30; וָלַד *id.*, 2 Sam. vi. 23; וָקַר *heavy*, Prov. xvii. 27; וָזַר *laden*, Ib. xxi. 8. In all which cases, and indeed in almost all others, in Arabic ו is taken for the first radical letter.

† I must dissent from Schrœder in supposing many of these roots to be conjugated like those commencing with נ (Reg. 72.), because, the analogy of the language requires a different process when certain vowels precede נ, from what it does when they precede ו, or י; and because the signification of these roots, though cognate, requires no such sacrifice of principle.

will go; אֵדַע *I shall know;* תֵּרֵד *she shall descend.* This sort of contraction generally takes place, when the last vowel of the leading word is (ֵ), probably for the purpose of promoting euphony, as in the segolate nouns. See Art. 114. In the following examples, (וֹ) is the last vowel of the primitive form: נָאוֹת *we agree*, Gen. xxxiv. 15; יֵאתוּ *they agreed*, 2 Kings xii. 9; יֵבוֹשׁ *he blushes:* but these two may be derived from אוּת and בּוֹשׁ as the roots.

6th, Of this kind the following are, according to Alting, the only verbs which occur; viz. יָאַת *he agreed;* יָדַע *he knew;* יָלַד *he begat;* יָלַךְ *he went;* יָצָא *he went out;* יָקַע *it was dislocated;* יָרַד *he descended;* יָרַע *it seemed evil;* יָשַׁב *he dwelt.* The following have both forms; יָחַם *he became hot;* יָצַר *he formed;* יָקַד *he burned;* יָקַר *it was precious;* יָשַׁם *he desolated*, and יָבַשׁ *he became dry*, to which יֵבוֹשׁ above noticed is referred by some. In a few the י is retained with (ֵ): as, אִיֵלְכָה *I will go*, Mic. i. 8; יֵיקַר *he shall be precious*, Ps. lxxii. 14.

7th, The former of these modes may be considered, therefore, as conformable with analogy; the latter, as accommodated to euphony.

8th, In all those verbs which are conformable with analogy (and all are so except the few above noticed) the Imperative and Infinitive follow the general paradigm: יָרֹק *spitting*, abs. יְסֹד *founding*, in construction יְרָא *fear thou*, &c.

9th, But, when this is not the case, the first radical letter is dropped, the final vowel remaining: as, רֵד Infinitive and Imperative, fem. רְדָה and רֶדֶת. This verb has also יָרֹד and יְרֹד for the Infinitive. So Imp. הָבִי and הַבִי *give*, root יָהַב; דַּע *know thou*, and with the paragogic ת, דְּעֵה. Infin. דַּעַת for דֵּעֶת and דֵּעָה (Art. 114.). But, what verbs may be used in the several forms, can be determined only by usage.

10th, Several forms of the Infinitive are occasionally derived from the same root: i. e. according to our system, sometimes the abstract noun of one form is taken, and sometimes the other: as, יָלוֹד *bringing forth*, Job xv. 35, form פָּקוֹד; לֶדֶת Gen. xvi. 16; לַת* (for לִדְתּ, form פִּקְדִּ)

---

* Kimchi tells us, that his brother derived this word from ילל, thus: for לֶלֶת, striking out the latter ל, לֶת, and varying the vowel לַת. In the

1 Sam. iv. 19. So יָרֵד *descending*, Gen. xlvi. 3; יַרְדִי (form פָּקְדִי) *my descending*, Ps. xxx. 4.

11th, To this variety of forms, perhaps, may be referred the following examples; אִם־שׁוֹב תֵּשְׁבוּ Jer. xlii. 10, *if ye will still abide*, where שׁוֹב is put for יָשׁוֹב the י being dropped, by Art. 82. כִּי־כָל תּוּכַל *that thou shalt surely prevail*; or, *prevailing shalt prevail*, Job xlii. 2, where כָל is put for יָכֹל, root יָכַל, by the same rule.

12th, This verb יָכַל forms the Present tense in *Kal*, as if the root had been יָכַל: as, אוּכַל, תּוּכַל, &c. for אֶוְכַל, תֶּוְכַל. See Art. 93. 2.

214. In the other species, viz. *Pīḥél*, *Pūḥál*, and *Hithpāḥél*, the analogy of the paradigm פָּקַד is regularly followed; excepting only, that in the verbs יָדַע *he knew*, נָגַח *he threw*, and, נָכַח *he contended*, the י of the root is changed to ו: as, הוֹדִיעַ *he made known*; הִתְוַדָּה *he confessed*; הִתְוַכֵּחַ *he disputed*. In *Pīḥél*, however, we have נִגַּח (for יְנַגֵּחַ Art. 79.) *he shall make grieve*, Lam. iii. 33; יָדוּ (for יְיִדּוּ) *they shall cast out*, Ib. iii. 53. In *Pūḥál* we have מְיֻוָּנִים for מְיֻיָּנִים Jer. v. 8.

2d, Let us now proceed to the others; viz. *Niphḥál*, *Hiphḥíl*, and *Hophḥál*, in which the first letter of the root will lose its consonantal power.

3d, It has already been remarked, that these verbs are sometimes conjugated as if י had been the first radical letter: this is the case in the three species before us. In *Niphḥál*, for example, we shall have in the Preterite נוֹשַׁב (for נִוָּשַׁב Art. 93.), from the root יָשַׁב or וָשַׁב. Present tense יִוָּשֵׁב (for יִנָּשֵׁב) where ו retains its consonantal power. In a few instances י remains in the Present: as, יִנָּחֵל *he shall be pierced with a dart*, Exod. xix. 13; יִנָּחֵל *he remains*, Gen. viii. 12; נִיחָם for נִיְחָם *made hot*, Is. lvii. 5. So also the Imperative and Infinitive are formed regularly: as, הִוָּשֵׁב. The participial noun, נוֹשָׁב, fem. נוֹשָׁבָה, נוֹשֶׁבֶת; pl. נוֹשָׁבִים and נוֹשָׁבוֹת. We have, however, נוּגוֹת *made mournful*, fem., Lam. i. 4, and נוּגֵי *id.* masc., Zeph. iii. 18. (for נְוּגוֹת &c. Art. 93. 2.).

Mikhlol, we generally have the leading word for the Present tense given: thus the root יָגַב–יְגֹב; root חָבַר–יַחֲבֹר; whence we are to infer, that the persons of the Present tense will be יֶחְבַּר, תֶּחְבַּר &c. root יָטַב–יִיטַב; whence Pres. יִיטַב, and so on.

4th, In *Hiphḥíl*, הוֹשִׁיב (for הַוְשִׁיב Art. 93.) and, in the Present tense, יוֹשִׁיב or יוֹשֵׁב, תּוֹשִׁיב, and so on throughout.

5th, In some roots, however, the (י) remains, and either forms a diphthong with the preceding vowel, or coalesces with it by contraction: as, first, הַיְצֵא, or הַוְצֵא according to the *Kĕthîv* (for הוֹצֵא, root יָצָא) *lead out*, Gen. viii. 17; הַיְשֵׁר or הַוְשֵׁר *direct thou*, Ps. v. 9; אַיְסִיר *I will chastise*, Hos. vii. 12. So in the Participle, or noun of agency, מַיְמִינִים *using the right hand*, 1 Chron. xii. 2. In the second place, the contraction may take place by the preceding letter taking (ּ): as, הֵיטִיב (for הֵיְטִיב Art. 93. 3.) *he gave prosperity*, Gen. xii. 16. So תֵּיטִיב, תֵּיטֵב, or תֵּיטַב &c. throughout; אֵימְנָה *I will take the right-hand direction*, Gen. xiii. 9. Inf. חֵימִין &c. In Exod. v. 7, we have תֵּאָסְפוּן *repeat ye*, where א stands in the place of י or ו: but, here the leading word may be אֹסִיף, from the root אָסַף, cognate with יָסַף: וַיֵּיטֵב for וַיִּיטֵב Job xxiv. 21; וַיֵּילֵל for וַיִּילֵל Is. xvi. 7; and אַיֵּילֵל for אֵילֵל Jer. xlviii. 31, may perhaps be attributed to the mistakes of the Librarians.

6th, In *Hophḥál* the ו of the root takes ו throughout: as, חוּשַׁב (for הָוְשַׁב, see Art. 93. 2.), *he was made to dwell*. So in the Present tense, יוּשַׁב, תּוּשַׁב &c.; or, in both cases with (ֵ) for וּ: as, חֵשַׁב, יֵשַׁב &c.

On the Conjugation of those Verbs which have ו *or* י *for their Medial Radical Letter.*

215. When these verbs terminate in a quiescent ה, in ח, ע, or ר; as also, when conjugated in those species which have *Dāgésh* in the middle radical, they follow the general paradigm: as, רָוָה *it was watered*; הָיָה *it became*; רָוַח *he breathed*; גָּוַע *he expired*; חָוַר *he became white*. So also קִיא *vomit*, Jer. xxv. 27, from קָיָה; אָיַב *he acted as an enemy*; עָיַף *he was weary*, which are perhaps only nouns.—With *Dāgésh* in the middle radical; as, עִוֵּת *he made crooked*; עָוַת and הִתְעַוֵּת *he was made crooked*. Verbs with a medial י; חִיֵּב *he criminated*; הִצְטַיֵּד *he procured by hunting*. In all other cases, the

medial radical ו or י loses its consonantal power, and gives rise to several apparently defective forms.

2d, Whenever, therefore, a single medial ו or י is preceded, either by a vowel or a final *Shĕvá;* and, at the same time, is followed by any vowel, it will be dropped, with the preceding vowel or *Shĕvá,* and its own vowel will be transposed to the first radical letter (Artt. 79. 81.): as, קָם for קָוַם *he stood;* מֵת for מָוֵת *he died;* אוֹר for אָוַר *he shone;* טֵב for טָוַב *he was good;* קוֹם for קָוֹם or קְוֹם. In *Niphḥál,* נָקוֹם for נִקְוַם; *Hiphḥíl,* הָאִיר for הַאְוִיר, הֵקִים for הַקְוִים; *Hophḥál,* הוּקַם for הָקְוַם &c. In like manner, when י is the middle radical, בֵּן for בָּיַן *he understood;* בִּין for בְּיִן, or בָּיִן; *Hiphḥíl,* הֵטִיב for הַטְיִב, הֵבִין for הַבְיִן; *Hophḥál,* הוּבַן or הָבַן, for הָבְיַן &c.*

3d, For the forms פְּקֹד and פִּקְדָ which may be used in the Imperatives and Infinitives, we here have קוֹם (for קְוֹם or קְוֹמְ Art. 93. 2.), and, בִּין (for בְּיִן, or בְּיִנְ Ib. 4.).

4th, In the *Pīḥél, Pūḥál,* and *Hithpāḥél* Species, when the middle radical is not doubled, which is mostly the case, the leading forms will be, פּוֹדֵד, פּוֹדַד, and הִתְפּוֹדֵד, respectively (Art. 210.): as, קוֹמֵם *he raised;* קוֹמַם and הִתְקוֹמֵם *he was raised:* and in these cases the process of the conjugation is regular throughout. Nouns of agency, &c. will be מְקוֹמֵם, מְקוֹמַם, מִתְקוֹמֵם, respectively, the feminines and plurals of which are regularly formed, when in use.

---

* In קָם, מֵת, and בֵּן, the vowels become perfect on account of the accent. In הֵקִים, הָאִיר, הֵטִיב, הוּקַם, הֵבִין and הוּבַן, the first vowel is made perfect, in order to complete the syllable; which becomes necessary on account of the first radical being taken to commence the next syllable. The (ֵ) is taken in *Hiphḥíl,* being the vowel obliquely correspondent to (ִ) of the regular paradigm. See Art. 102. 2.

5th, The Participial noun in *Kal* is, for the most part, constructed on the same form with the Preterite; as, קָם, pl. קָמִים &c.; מֵת, pl. מֵתִים; בֶּן, pl. בָּנִים &c. The passive, לָוּט for לָוּוט *involved*, form פָּקוּד; מָל for מָוּל *circumcised*. So שִׂים for שָׂיִים; form פָּקִיד *placed*. In a very few instances the Participle, or noun of agency, seems to be of the form פָּקוֹד: as, קוֹם for קָוֹם *standing*, 2 Kings xvi. 7; בּוֹס *treading*, for בָּוֹס Zech. x. 5.

6th, In the first and second persons of both genders and numbers, in the Preterite of *Niphhál*, the leading word seems to be a segolate of the form פִּקְדָ or פִּקְדֵ, i. e. קוּם for קָוְמְ, בִּין for בָּוְנְ; in which cases, the vowel (וּ) is introduced between the root and the abbreviated pronoun: as, נְקוּמוֹתָ, נְקוּמוֹת, נְקוּמוֹתֶם &c. So נְבִינוֹתָ, נְבִינוֹת, נְבִינוֹתֶם, and so on. Alting thinks this has been done, in order to give the fuller pronunciation to the accent, as in נְקוּמוֹתָ; but, in נְקוּמוֹתֶם the accent does not accompany that syllable. That reason, therefore, will not hold good. I am inclined to believe, that קוּמָה, or its equivalent קוּמָ, is rather the leading word taken in these particular cases. Certain it is, that in Arabic we have in the fourth species the masdar وَقَامَة, i. e. אֲקָוָאמָה for אֲקָוָמָה, from the root קום. If, then, we take נְקוּמַ, and by Art. 93. נְקוּמוֹ, we shall have the precise form here used. What might have induced the ancients to select one form in preference to another, it is not easy to say.

7th, In every other case *Niphhál* takes the leading word קוֹם: as, נָקוֹם for נָקְוֹם, as in נַחְתּוֹם, נַעֲתּוֹר &c.

8th, A similar anomaly takes place in the corresponding persons of the *Hiphhíl* species, which may perhaps be accounted for in the same way: as, הֲקִימוֹתָ, הֲקִימוֹת, הֲקִימוֹתִי &c., but here, we also have the regular form; as, הֲקִמְתָּ, הֲקִמְתְּ, הֲקִמְתִּי.

9th, It must be remembered, that whenever the first radical letter is, by any accident, made to commence a syllable, the preformative must, by our laws of syllabication, either take *Shĕvá*, or a *perfect* vowel. When the accent is far removed it will be *Shĕvá*; but, when not, the vowel will be perfect: as, Present tense, *Kal*, יָקוּם, תָּקוּם, תָּקוּמִי, pl. תְּקוּמְיָנָה &c.* So, in the nouns of patience and agency, in *Niphhál*

---

* Here as in *Niphhál*, noticed above, קוּמָה, or קוֹמָה, and hence קוּמִי, may have been the leading word.

and *Hiphḥíl*, נָקוֹם, fem. נְקוֹמָה, pl. נְקוֹמִים &c. *Hiph.* מֵקִים, fem. מְקִימָה, pl. מְקִימִים &c. In *Hophḥál*, however, no such change takes place: as, חוּקַם, 2 pers. pl. חוּקַמְתֶּם, חוּקַמְתֶּן &c.

10th, Verbs having a medial (י) will sometimes drop it, and supply its place by (ֵ), as it often happens in the *Hiphḥíl* species; as, תֵּלֵן for תָּלִין *thou shalt lodge;* and, with the accent placed on the penultimate, תָּלֵן 2 Sam. xvii. 16. But, when either the first or last radical happens to be a guttural, we shall have (-): as, יָעַף *he was wearied*, 1 Sam. xiv. 28; יָנַח *he rested*, Exod. x. 14, for יָנִיחַ or יָנֻחַ. So with ר, יָסַר *he put away*, Gen. viii. 13. The same will occasionally take place with a pause accent: as, תָּלֵן Judg. xix. 20.

11th, Hence it will appear, that verbs having a medial ו may, in the present tense of *Kal*, take the same form, which they, as well as those having a medial י, will in *Hiphḥíl;* and, that they can be distinguished only by the context.

On the Third Class of Defective Verbs.

216. These verbs are formed upon roots whose third radical letter is subject to elision; and this may take place, either when one of the letters אהוי occupies that situation (Art. 211. 2.), or, when the second and third radical letter happen to be the same (Art. 83.): as also in certain cases, when נ or ת is found in that place (Artt. 82. and 201. 22.).

2d, But, before we proceed to the detail of these defects, it will be necessary to offer a few observations on the causes which have led to them: and first, we shall consider those which have one or other of the letters אהוי for their third radical.

3d, It has already been remarked (Art. 213.), that considerable difficulty has been felt both in the Hebrew and Arabic, in ascertaining which is the proper root, in many instances wherein these letters are concerned. It is also a fact, that primitive words having either of these letters for the first, second, or third radical, as also those

which have the same for the second and third, to which may be added those commencing with נ, are generally found to have either the same, or very nearly the same, signification. Of course we speak here, only of those words which are found thus assimilated, and not of every possible case that can be imagined: for example, יָצַב, יָצַב or נָצַב *he* SET UP, to which perhaps may be added, as being cognate, צָבָא *he arranged,* or *assembled, an army, performed divine service,* &c. which some also make cognate with צְבִי *beauty,* and צָבָה *he became inflated,* &c. So יָלַל, כָּלַל, כּוּל, כִּיל, כָּלָה *comprehending, completing,* &c.,* to which many others may be added, were it necessary to do so.

4th, If this be the case, then, we need not be surprised in occasionally finding the vowels, and even the signification

---

* So בָּשַׁשׁ and בּוּשׁ; טָבַב, טוּב; נָגַד, נָגַד; צָדַד, צָדַד; רָעַע, רוּעַ; קָצַץ, קוּץ; רָבַב, רוּב &c. See the Mikhlol of Kimchi, fol. קיט, where a large list of this sort of verbs is given.

It may be proper here to notice remarks sometimes made on verbs of this kind, which, I am induced to believe, are entitled to little credit. "Singularis *Linguæ* genius," says A. Schultens, Inst. Ling. Heb. p. 399, "et granditas stili, sæpe ansam præbuere, ad *geminæ Radicis formas* in *unam* conflandas." The first example he gives is הִבְאִישׁ Is. xxx. 5, which he calls "specimen insigne. *Hiphh. Radicum* בָּאַשׁ *aruit*, et בָּשַׁשׁ *fætuit*, signantissimi præ se ferens: ex הִבְאִישׁ *fætere fecit*, et הוֹבִישׁ *acescere fecit*, coalitum." Remarks of this kind are often met with in the Thesaurus Grammaticus of Buxtorf, in the Mikhlol of Kimchi, the Rabbinical Commentaries, &c. I must confess, however, I can see little in all this, but the occasional adoption of one or other of the cognate roots, as indeed it occasionally happens in the Arabic, without any intention, on the part of the writer, to combine more ideas than one in such verb. In the above instance, then, I believe בָּאַשׁ to have been the root taken, to be used nevertheless in the sense of בּוּשׁ. In this instance, therefore, I must object to the vowel (וֹ) *Khōlém*: because, I think, it may have been introduced for the purpose of supporting an hypothesis, unworthy of the simplicty of character always attendant on the sacred writers. In Eichhorn's edition of Simonis's Lexicon, sub voce בּוּשׁ, א is said to be *otiose.*

of one cognate root applied to another: as, רְפֵה, for רְפָא *heal thou* (root רָפַה *becoming lax*), Ps. lx. 4; אֶרְפֶּה, for אֶרְפָּא *I will heal,* Jer. iii. 22. So, with respect to the vowels only: as, כָּלֶאתִי, for כָּלָאתִי *I restrained,* Ps. cxix. 101; as if the root had been כָּלֵה; מוֹצֵא, for מוֹצָא *finding,* Eccles. vii. 26; רְפֵאנוּ, for רְפָאנוּ *we have healed,* Jer. li. 9; הַנִּבְאוֹת *prophesying,* Zech. xiii. 4; חֹטֵא *sinning,* Eccl. viii. 12, where the vowels belong to roots having ה or י for the last radical.

5th, The following assume their vowels; and, in some instances, their forms, from a cognate root: נְשׂוּי *taken away,* Ps. xxxii. 1, where the form is derived from נָשֵׂה, the root being נָשָׂא. So תִּרְפֶּינָה *they* (fem.) *will heal,* Job v. 18; יִרְפּוּ *they will heal,* Jer. viii. 11, and נִרְפְּתָה *she,* or *it, was healed,* Ib. li. 9; נִפְלֵיתִי *I wondered,* Ps. cxxxix. 14; צָמֵת *thou hast thirsted,* Ruth ii. 9 (for צָמֵית as if the root had been צָמֵה, but which is צָמָא). In like manner, we have נָשְׂוּ *they bear* (root נָשָׂא) Ezek. xxxix. 26; מָלְוּ *they are full,* Ib. xxviii. 16; נִטְמֵינוּ *we are vile,* Job xviii. 3, to which many more might be added; but, as they are always noticed in the best Lexicons, they need not be detailed here.

6th, It may perhaps be said, that these variations of the vowels may all be ascribed to the Masorets. I answer, had not the analogy by which the vowels are thus varied, extended itself also to the consonants, this suggestion may have had some weight: but, as this is also the case, it is hardly fair to ascribe to that school of Critics every apparent anomaly in the vowels, with which we may occasionally meet: besides, it seems to me more likely, that if the Masorets had affixed these vowels according to certain established rules, we should have met with no difficulties of this sort; which, nevertheless, are consistent enough with the analogy of this language.

7th, Thus much being premised, we may now proceed to consider the conjugation of these verbs.

8th, In the first place, then, every root, terminating

with a *radical* ה, that is, with ה having *Mappík* inscribed, will be regularly conjugated like פָּקַד: as, גָּבַהּ *he was high;* גָּבַהְתָּ *thou wast high;* גָּבְהוּ *they were high,* &c. This letter, therefore, is not subject to any elision, either here or elsewhere.

9th, It is, therefore, when ה is a substitute for ו, or י, only, that any departure from the general paradigm can take place, in any case.

10th, In the following instances, however, no such substitution has taken place, but ו and י retain their original places: שָׁלַוְתִּי *I have been tranquil,* Job iii. 26; Infin. *Kal,* fem. שַׁלְוָה; Participial noun, שָׁלֵו, of the same root שלו. So רָאֹה, Infin. Ezek. xxviii. 17, from the root רָאָה, usually רָאֵה. In *Pīhél,* אֲרַוֶּה *I will water,* Is. xvi. 9. But, in Job xii. 6, we have (י) for the last radical: as, יִשְׁלָיוּ *they will be tranquil* (where the accent has been drawn back) Art. 125. 11. So, חָסָיָה *it trusted,* fem., Ps. lvii. 2; יִרְבָּיוּן *they multiply,* Deut. viii. 13, where, in the next member, we have יִרְבֶּה; תִּדַּמְיוּן *ye assimilate,* Is. xl. 18. 25; עֲטָיָה *becoming languid,* Cantic. i. 7; בּוֹכִיָּה *weeping,* Lam. i. 16. So also, מְמֻחִים *things full of marrow,* Is. xxv. 6. In all other instances, ה will be substituted for either ו or י, and then will be subject to elision, by the general rules affecting the letters אהוי.

11th, In the Preterite tense, therefore, of all the species, ◌ָה will be the termination for the third person singular masculine, instead of ◌ִי or ◌ֻו; ת of the feminine, just as it is in the feminine nouns in construction. In all the others, י will represent the third radical: as, גָּלָה *he revealed, discovered;* fem. גָּלְתָה; so 2 pers. masc. גָּלִיתָ id.; fem. גָּלִית; 1 pers. com. גָּלִיתִי; pl. 3 pers. com. גָּלוּ; 2 masc. גְּלִיתֶם id.; fem. גְּלִיתֶן; 1 com. גָּלִינוּ.

12th, It must be remembered, however, that in every other species (◌ֱ) is the vowel which precedes י in the Preterite. Even in *Kal* (◌ֱ) would be more agreeable with the analogy than (◌ִ), because גָּלִיתָ &c. should be, according to the general paradigm, גָּלֵיתָ, which by Art.

93. 3. would become גָּלִיתָ: but, as (ֶ), &c. preceding ְ may also become (ַ): supposing (ֶ) to have been with the second radical (Art. 93. 4.), this may have been adopted in this species.

13th, The Present tense of every species here ends in ־ֶה,* as do also the Participles. The Imperative has ־ֵה, but this is the form of construction assumed by all nouns ending in ־ֵה (Art. 151. 5.), and such must the Imperative generally be.

14th, The Infinitives follow the general paradigm, and end in ה־ in the masculine: as, רָאֹה and רְאֹה *seeing*.† The feminine form always ends in וֹת: as, גָּלוֹת or גְּלוֹת (for גָּלֳוֹת Art. 93.).

15th, The agent or active participle will end in ־ֵה: as, גֹּלֵה; fem. גֹּלָה (for גֹּלֵהָה Art. 79.). The patient or passive participle ends in וּי: as, גָּלוּי, form פָּקוּד, regularly, where the final י is quiescent, fem. גְּלוּיָה, pl. גְּלוּיִים and גְּלוּיוֹת: and י appears as the proper radical letter.‡

---

* Except the 2 pers. sing. fem and pl. masc. and fem., as also, 3 masc. and fem. pl., where ה is dropped, or changed to ־ֶי: as, 3 m. יִגְלֶה, f. תִּגְלֶה; 2 m. תִּגְלֶה, f. תִּגְלִי (for תִּגְלֶהִי Art. 79.); 1 com. אֶגְלֶה. Pl. 3 m. יִגְלוּ (for יִגְלֶהוּ Art. 79.), f. תִּגְלֶינָה; 2 m. תִּגְלוּ (for תִּגְלֶהוּ as before), f. תִּגְלֶינָה; 1 com. נִגְלֶה. In the same manner are the Present tenses of all the species conjugated.

† In קָנוֹ *acquiring*, 2 Sam. xxiv. 24, and in הֹרוֹ וְהֹגוֹ *conceiving and meditating*, Is. lix. 13, Schrœder thinks we have ו final for the last radical letter: but this is far from being certain; קָנוֹת, הֹרוֹת and הֹגוֹת would terminate regularly according to our pardigm; and, omitting the final ת by Art. 78, we shall have the forms, קָנוֹ, הֹרוֹ and הֹגוֹ. The other example, viz. חַגְוֵי Hos. vi. 9, adduced by him, may be a plural noun in construction.

‡ In Is. iii. 16, we have a various reading, viz. נְטוּיוֹת and נְטוּוֹת, as also in 1 Sam. xxv. 18; עֲשׂוּיוֹת and עֲשׂוּוֹת, no reliance, therefore, can be placed on Schrœder's remark, that these are words retaining their primitive radical ו.

On those Verbs which have an א *for the Third Radical Letter.*

217. The only departure from the general paradigm found in verbs of this kind is, in the א becoming quiescent in the preceding vowel: as, Pret. Kal. מָצָא for מָצַא *he found*, f. מָצְאָה, 2 m. מָצָאתָ, f. מָצָאת, 1 com. מָצָאתִי; pl. מָצְאוּ, com. 2 m. מְצָאתֶם, f. מְצָאתֶן, 1 com. מָצָאנוּ.

2d, The Present tense, יִמְצָא, תִּמְצָא, and so on.

In every person of both tenses, except the third singular and plural of the Preterite of both genders, in every other species (except that of *Pūḥál*, and the Present of *Hiphḥíl*), the vowel preceding א is (ָ). As *Niphḥál*, 3 m. נִמְצָא, f. נִמְצְאָה, 2 m. נִמְצָאתָ, f. נִמְצָאת, 1 com. נִמְצָאתִי; plur. com. נִמְצְאוּ &c. Pres. tense, יִמָּצֵא &c.; *Hiph.* הִמְצִיא, f. הִמְצִיאָה, 2 masc. הִמְצֵאתָ &c. Pres. 3 m. יַמְצִיא, f. תַּמְצִיא &c. In *Pīḥél* and *Hithpāḥél* all is regular. In *Pūḥál* we have, Pret. 3 pers. masc. מֻצָּא, f. מֻצְאָה; 2 m. מֻצָּאתָ, f. מֻצָּאת &c. Pres. 3 m. יְמֻצָּא, f. תְּמֻצָּא; 2 m. תְּמֻצָּא, f. תְּמֻצְאִי &c. and so on throughout.

We have, however, יְשֻׁנֶּא *it shall be changed*, Eccl. viii. 1, where, according to Kimchi, the vowels belong to the root שָׁנָה. Mikhlol, fol. קעד.

3d, In the Infinitives and Participles a contraction mostly takes place: as, שְׂאֵת or שֵׂאת, for שֶׂאֶת, of נְשֵׂאת *bearing*, root נָשָׂא; מוֹצֵאת for מוֹצֶאת, root מָצָא *finding*. We also have מוֹצְאֵת. So also שְׂנֹאת for שִׂנְאֵת *hating*, form פִּקֻּדַת, root שָׂנֵא; קְרֹאת or קְרֹאוֹת *calling*; מְלֹאת or מְלֹאוֹת *filling*.

So likewise עָשׂוּ Job xli. 24, may be a verb, and צָפוּ Ib. xv. 22, for צָפְיוּ by Art. 78. By the same rule we have נָקִי *clear, innocent*, for נָקְיִי &c.

4th, Some verbs here, as in the other classes, have (ֶ) for the last vowel of the Preterite of *Kal:* as, יָרֵא *he feared;* מָלֵא *he filled;* שָׂנֵא *he hated;* צָמֵא *he thirsted,* which they will retain throughout that tense, where other verbs have (ַ): as, 3 m. יָרֵא, f. יָרְאָה; 2 m. יָרֵאתָ, f. יָרֵאת; 1 com. יָרֵאתִי; and so on. In every other tense and species they are conjugated like מָצָא.

5th, For the rules and examples relating to Apocope when happening to these or any other verbs, see Artt. 80. 125. 3—8.

LECTURE XIII.

ON THOSE VERBS WHICH HAVE THEIR SECOND AND THIRD RADICAL LETTERS THE SAME.

218. It has been laid down as a rule, that whenever the last two letters of any primitive word happen to be the same, one of them may be dropped for the sake of euphony (Art. 83.). There are cases, however, in which this cause has no influence: these we shall notice first; and then proceed to shew in what instances, and in what way, our rule applies.

2d, First, then, in the reduplicated species, i. e. in *Pīḥél, Pūḥál,* and *Hithpāḥél,* the middle radical letter will either receive *Dāgésh forte,* as in פִּקֵּד, or, the reduplication will take place on the measure פּוֹדֵד, פּוֹדָד, or הִתְפּוֹדֵד; or, lastly, on one or other of the reduplicated forms (Art. 210.). In these cases, therefore, no defect takes place.

3d, In the next place, the following examples follow the general paradigm: as, זָמַם *he intended,* Deut. xix. 19; זַמֹּתִי *I intended,* Zech. viii. 14; כָּלְלוּ *they finished,* Ezek. xxvii. 11; סָבְבוּ *they surrounded,* Eccles. xii. 5, &c.; עָשְׁשָׁה *it decayed,* Ps. vi. 8: חָנּוֹן *being gracious,* Isa. xxx. 19.

4th, The Participial nouns of *Kal:* as, סֹבֵב *surrounding,* Gen. ii. 13, pl. סֹבְבִים 2 Chron. iv. 3; אָרוּר *cursed,* Gen. xxvii. 29, pl. אֲרוּרִים Josh. ix. 23, &c.

5th, In some instances the Infinitive also takes the form פִּקָּד: as, לִסְבֹּב *for surrounding,* Numb. xxi. 4; לַחֲמֹם *for warming,* Isa. xlvii. 14, form פִּקָּד, with (-) changed to (ֹ) on account of the pause (Art. 130. 5.).

6th, Again, in no case, in which either the first or third radical letter of any root is subject to elision or

contraction, will our rule take place: as, with reference to the first, יְהוֹדוּן for יְנַהוֹדוּן *they flee,* Ps. lxviii. 13; הֵילִיל *he exclaimed,* root יָלַל; הַחְתַּתִּי *I broke to pieces,* Jer. xlix. 37, for הַחַתַּתִּי. So, חָיָה for חָיִי. But, when this is not the case, and the last radical retains its consonantal power, one of the two is dropped: as, חַי for חָיִי *he lived,* Gen. v. 5.

7th, Whenever, therefore, one or other of these exceptions does not fall in our way, one of the two last radical letters of these verbs will regularly be rejected in both the tenses—in the Imperative, and occasionally in the Infinitive of *Kal,*—the whole of the species *Niphḥál, Hiphḥíl,* and *Hophḥál.*

8th, The most convenient method, perhaps, of stating this defect, is by saying, that the second radical with the preceding vowel, or *Shĕvá,* is rejected: as, סָב, for סָבַב; *Niph.* נָסַב, for נִסְבַּב, &c. which will hold throughout.

9th, In both tenses, then, of the species *Kal, Niphḥál, Hiphḥíl,* and *Hophḥál,* as also in their Infinitives, Imperatives, and Participles, excepting those already mentioned, will the second radical letter of all such roots be rejected; but, whenever any asyllabic augment takes place, this rejected letter will be restored by the operation of *Dāgésh forte* (Art. 83.).

10th, If, in the next place, we except the first and second persons of both numbers and genders, throughout all the Preterites of these species, the abbreviated pronouns which are asyllabic will be the same in these as in other verbs. But, in all the first and second persons of these Preterites, the vowel וֹ is introduced, as in Art. 216. 6. between the root and the pronouns: as, taking סָבַב for the root, 3 m. סָב. f. סָבָה, 2 m. סַבּוֹתָ, f. סַבּוֹת; 1 com. סַבּוֹתִי; pl. סַבּוֹתֶם, סַבּוֹתֶן, סַבּוֹנוּ.

So in *Niphḥál:* 3 m. נָסַב, f. נָסַבָּה, 2 m. נָסַבְתָּ, נְסַבּוֹת, and so on.*

11th, It should also be observed, that, as the first letter of the root, in these cases, necessarily commences a syllable, the preformative will either take *Shĕvá* (:), or a perfect vowel. It will take *Shĕvá,* when the accent is on the third letter, or farther from the beginning of the word; in all other cases the vowel will be perfect: as Pres. *Kal,* 3 pers. m. יָסֹב, f. תָּסֹב; pl. m. יָסֹבּוּ, f. תְּסֻבֶּינָה, &c. *Niphḥál,* Pret. 3 m. נָסַב, f. נָסַבָּה, 2 m. נָסַבְתָּ, f. נְסַבּוֹת, &c. *Hiphḥíl,* Pret. 3 m. הֵסֵב, f. הֵסֵבָּה, 2 m. הֲסִבּוֹתָ, f. הֲסִבּוֹת; 3 pl. com. הֵסֵבּוּ, 2 m. הֲסִבּוֹתֶם, f. הֲסִבּוֹתֶן, &c. Pres. 3 m. sing. יָסֵב, f. תָּסֵב, 2 m. תָּסֵב, f. תָּסֵבִּי; 1 com. אָסֵב, 3 pl. m. יָסֵבּוּ, f. תְּסֻבֶּינָה, &c.

12th, It should be remembered, that the י usually found introduced between the second and third radical, and which is considered as characteristic of the *Hiphḥíl* species, never appears in these verbs.

13th, In *Hophḥál,* ו is inserted after the characteristic ה, in order to complete the initial syllable; after which this Species is conjugated like the preceding: as, Pret. 3. m. sing. הוּסַב, f. הוּסַבָּה, 2 m. הוּסַבְתָּ, f. הוּסַבּוֹת; 1 com. הוּסַבְתִּי, &c. Present: 3 sing. m. יוּסַב, f. תּוּסַב, 2 m. תּוּסַב, f. תּוּסַבִּי; pl. תּוּסַבֶּינָה. In the last, and every similar case in this Species, the first vowel is necessarily immutable: it must, therefore, remain perfect. So in the Imperative and Participle, הוּסַב, f. הוּסַבִּי, &c.; מוּסָב, f. מוּסַבָּה, &c.

---

* In these cases, perhaps, as before, we have some such form as סַבּוֹת for the leading word of these persons: and, it is a fact, that we have Infinitives occasionally appearing of this form: as, חַנּוֹת *shewing favour,* Ps. lxxvii. 10, root חָנַן; שַׁמּוֹת *desolating,* Ezek. xxxvi. 3; חַלּוֹתִי *my wounding,* Ps. lxxvii. 11.

14th, In these, as in all other verbs, the final vowel of both the tenses in *Kal* may be (ֶ), (ַ), or (ָ). The root above given exemplifies (ֶ) for the last vowel of the Preterite, and (ָ) for that of the Present. The only variety, however, which occurs is, in having (ָ) for the last vowel of the Preterite, and (ֶ) for that of the Present: as, רָבוּ *they cast,* of רָבַב Gen. xlix. 23; גָּל *he* (who) *devolves upon,* Ps. xxii. 9. So in the Infinitives and Imperatives, which are generally constructed on the same form with the Present, with (ֶ): as, גֶּל, for גָּלַל *devolve thou,* Ps. cxix. 22. Present: יֵקַלּוּ *they shall be vile,* for יְקֻלְלוּ 1 Sam. ii. 30. In *Hiphḥil,* also, we have occasionally (ֶ): as, הֵקֶל *he made light,* for הִקְלַל Is. viii. 23. Participle: מֵצֶל *giving shade,* for מְצַלַּל Ezek. xxxi. 3.

15th, In the species *Pīḥél, Pūḥál,* and *Hithpāḥél,* the forms assumed for conjugation must be determined by usage, i. e. whether they are to be פִּקֵּד, פּוֹדֵד, פּוּדַד, הִתְפַּקֵּד, הִתְפּוֹדֵד, or any other of the reduplicated forms (Art. 210.); and when this is done, the process will be analogous to that of the general paradigm.

16th, Of the verbs terminating in נ or ת, enough has been said, Art. 211. 10. 201. 22. 27. 28.

On the doubly Defective Verbs: i. e. *Verbs, in which more than one of their Radical Letters may be subject to quiescence or elision, by the operation of the preceding Rules.*

219. Roots may be supposed to exist composed of such letters as may all be subject to elision or quiescence, when occurring in certain situations: but, that they all should be subject, at the same time, to such rule, the nature of the case makes impossible: because, quiescence can take place, only when some homogeneous vowel precedes; and this pre-supposes that such vowel is enounced by a consonant. And, in the case of

one of the two last radical letters of a verb being dropped, it is also supposed, that some preceding vowel is enounced, which cannot be done without the influence of a preceding consonant.

2d, Hence it will follow, that such part of any root as is unaffected by the influence of a preceding vowel will remain unaltered: and also, that no two contiguous letters can at the same time be subject to defect by the process of conjugation, if we except the operation of apocope, and those cases in which any of the אהוי letters are dropped, as being unnecessary to the pronunciation. Of two contiguous letters, the one may be subject to defect, the other to quiescence, or even both to quiescence. But, when the first and last are subject to quiescence or elision, the middle radical letter, be that what it may, will generally retain its consonantal power, and may receive a *Dāgésh forte;* or if not capable of being doubled, may be compensated in the preceding vowel being made perfect.

3d, In this case, therefore, as in all the preceding ones, the general paradigm holds good: but, as the concurrence of certain sounds is incompatible with the pronunciation of a Hebrew, some changes regularly take place, in order to avoid this difficulty. And, as these changes cannot exceed certain limits, some part of the root must necessarily remain, and such compensation be made as custom has established. Example, however, is always easier to be understood than precept, we shall give, therefore, a few examples of all the cases that do occur; which after Schrœder, we shall divide into three classes.

First Class.

4th, This class will have the first and third radical letters subject, at the same time, to elision, or quiescence. And first, when both are subject to elision: as, נָתַן *he*

gave, placed; נָגַן *he played on the psaltery;* נָחַת *he descended,* which will drop either the נ or ת, or both, by rules already detailed (Art. 82. 211. 10. 201. 22. 28. &c.): e. g. in *Niphḥál,* Pret. 2 pers. נִתַּתָּ, נִתַּתְּ, נִתַּתִּי, נִנְתַּנְתָּ, נִנְתַּנְתְּ; and so of the rest.

5th, When the first is subject to quiescence, and the third to elision: as, אָמַן *he was faithful;* יָשַׁן *he slept;* אָפַת or יָפַת *he was handsome.* Here the ן will be rejected, as before, whenever it is affected by a final *Shĕvá* (:) by analogy: the final ת, by Art. 201. 28: and the initial י or א, will be quiescent, according to the rules detailed in Artt. 212. 213. 214.

6th, In the next place, the first will be subject to elision and the third to quiescence, in such roots as נָשָׂא *he bore;* as, Present tense, 3 p. m. *Kal,* יִשָּׂא for יִנְשָׂא (Art. 211.); Imp. שָׂא; Inf. שְׂאֵת, שְׂאֵת, or שְׂאֵת. *Niph.* Pret. and Part. נִשָּׂא. *Hiphḥíl,* Pret. הִשִּׂיא. *Hoph.* הֻשָּׂא: also in roots terminating in ה, for ו or י: as, נָטָה *he extended;* Pres. *Kal,* יִטֶּה; and, by Apocope (Art. 125. 7.), יֵט or יֶט. But here, the Imperative and Infinitive are sometimes written at length: as, נְטֵה *extend,* Exod. viii. 1, &c.; נְטוֹת *declining,* Num. xxii. 26. In *Niphḥál,* נִטּוּ for נִנְטָהוּ, and, with a pause accent (Art. 125. 11.), נָטֻיּוּ *are they extended,* Num. xxiv. 6. *Hiphḥíl,* הִנְטַהְתָּהוּ, 3 sing. fem. with the pronoun הוּ, for הֵטַתּוּ *she subdued him,* Prov. vii. 21. Pres. תַּט for תַּטֶּה, by apocope, *incline,* Ps. cxli. 4, and Imper. הַט for הַטֶּה *incline thou,* Ps. xvii. 6.

7th, Again; verbs, having both the first and third radical letter subject to quiescence: as, יֵתֵא (for יֵאתֵא, contraction of יֵאֵתֵא Art. 93. 5., from the root אָתָא) *he will come,* Deut. xxxiii. 21; יֹאפֶה (for יְאֹפֶה Ib. from the root אָפָה) *he will bake:* and 1 Sam. xxviii. 24, תֹּפֶהָ *she bakes it,* where the first and last radical are

dropped; יֵצֵא *he will go out,* for יִיצֵא, root יָצָא. Imper. צֵא. Infin. צוֹא, צָא, צָאָה, and צֵאת. So יָרֵא *he feared;* Pres. *Kal.* יִירָא or יִרָא; Infin. לִרְאֹ for לִירְאֹה. *Niphḥál,* Pret. or Part. נוֹרָא; יָרָה *he cast,* Pres. *Kal,* יִירֶה. Hence נִירֶם *we shoot them,* Num. xxi. 30. In *Hiphḥíl,* יוֹרֶה, and, by apocope, יֹור *he shot,* 2 Kings xiii. 17: יָגָה *he grieved;* Pret. *Hiphḥíl,* הוֹגָה; Pres. pl. תּוֹגוּ; and Job xix. 2: תּוֹגְיוּן, with a paragogic *Nún* (Art. 127. 6.). *Hophḥál,* הוּגָה, whence תּוּגָה *pain.* Participle of *Niphḥál,* נוּגוֹת *persons* (fem.) *pained,* Lam. i. 4, &c.

Second Class.

8th, The second class of doubly defective roots, are those which have a medial ו or י subject to quiescence, and the third subject to elision: as, בּוּן or בִּין *he understood;* לוּן *he lodged;* שׂוּת *he placed;* as, שַׂתָּ for שָׂוַתְתָּ *thou hast placed;* לַנּוּ *we have lodged,* for לָוַנְנוּ (Art. 81. 82. 201. 22.). But, in these verbs, the final נ is not universally rejected: as, בַּנְתָּה *thou hast understood,* Ps. cxxxix. 2.

Third Class.

9th, The third class comprehends those verbs which have ו or י for the middle radical, and א or ה for the third: each of which may be subject to quiescence, and in certain cases to rejection.

10th, Of the first sort בּוֹא *entering in;* נָוֶא *being crude,* and קוֹא or קִיא *vomiting,* are examples, which may thus be conjugated.

PRET.

KAL.

3 p. m. sing. בָּא, f. בָּאָה; 2 m. בָּאתָ, f. בָּאת; 1 com. בָּאתִי. Pl. 3 com. בָּאוּ, &c.

PRES.

3 p. m. sing. יָבֹא, f. תָּבֹא; 2 m. תָּבֹא, f. תָּבֹאִי; 1 com. אָבֹא. Pl. 3 m. יָבֹאוּ, &c.

IMP.

3 p. m. sing. בֹּא, f. בֹּאִי; 2 m. בֹּאוּ. Pl. f. בֹּאֶינָה, or בֹּאנָה.

INFIN.

בֹּא, or בּוֹא, בִּיא, בִּיאָה.

PART.

Masc. sing. בָּא, f. בָּאָה. Pl. בָּאִים, f. בָּאוֹת.

11th, In those cases, wherein *Khōlém* seems to represent the middle radical, ו is often inserted: as, יָבוֹא, תָּבוֹא &c. for יָבֹא, תָּבֹא &c. And, in others, where *Kāmétz* marks the radical א, א is sometimes omitted (Art. 78.): as, בָּנוּ for בָּאנוּ *we came in*, 1 Sam. xxv. 8.

In *Hiphhíl* we have, Pret. הֵבִיא, הֲבִיאֹתָ, or הֲבִיאוֹתָ &c. Pres. יָבִיא or יְבִיא or יָבֵא, תָּבִיא, and so on. Infinitive, הָבִיא, הָבֵא, and, with א dropped, הָבִי. Part. מֵבִיא or מֵבִי. Pret. *Hophhál*, הוּבָא, הוּבְאָה, הוּבָאתָ, הוּבָאת, הוּבָאתִי. Pres. יוּבָא, תּוּבָא &c. Part. מוּבָא &c.

12th, Examples, in which both a medial ו or י, and final ה, are at the same time quiescent, seldom occur, if we except those forms of the Present, which are said to be subject to apocope: as, יְהִי, for יִהְיֶה *he shall*, or *may be*; so יְהוּא for יִהְיֶה by apocope (Art. 93. 2.), and with a paragogic א: root חָיָה for חָיָה Eccles. xi. 3. In all other cases the middle radical letter retains its consonantal power, the third only being subject to quiescence: as,

PRET.

3 p. m. sing. חָיָה, f. חָיְתָה; 2 m. חָיִיתָ, f. חָיִית; 1 com. חָיִיתִי. 3 p. m. pl. חָיוּ, 2 m. חֲיִיתֶם, f. חֲיִיתֶן; 1 com. חָיִינוּ.

PRES.

3 p. m. sing. יִהְיֶה, apoc. יְהִי, f. תִּהְיֶה, apoc. תְּהִי &c.

13th, Verbs of this kind are seldom found conjugated beyond the first or second species; and perhaps never throughout those.

It must be borne in mind, that in any of these verbs the paragogic א or ן may occur in their usual places—that any of the אהוי letters may be dropped or not, when the preceding vowels will preserve the pronunciation of the word—that the second persons singular of the Preterite may have ה added: as, נָתַתָּה *thou gavest;* and that *Dāgésh forte* may occasionally be omitted, and a compensation made by the preceding vowel being made perfect. But, as the Dictionaries and Concordances will always shew in what cases these take place, it will not be necessary to note them down here.

On the Inseparable Pronouns when attached to Verbs.

220. When the inseparable pronouns are found attached to nouns, the meaning of the compound will, as we have seen (Art. 153. 1.), be propriety, possession, or the like: for in no other way can nouns and personal pronouns be construed together: but, when the same pronouns are combined with verbs, which are already compounded with pronouns by the process of conjugation, then, if the verbs are transitive, these further affixed pronouns must be considered as being complementary of the signification of such verbs, or what we usually term an objective case: but, if the verbs be intransitive, then must they be translated, by introducing some preposition or other word explanatory of the connexion thus formed: as, גָּדַלְנִי *he grew up for me,* or *with me,* Job xxxi. 18; קָדַשְׁתִּיךָ *I am holy* (as to) *thee,* i. e. *I am holier than thou,* Is. lxv. 5. So יִגָּרְךָ *shall dwell* (with) *thee,* Ps. v. 5. But, we shall have occasion to speak more particularly on this subject when we come to the Syntax.

221. The next question will be, How will the addition of these pronouns affect the vowels and consonants of the verbs? Generally, having the vowels of the affixed pronouns given, those which precede and are mutable will be regulated by the general laws prevailing in the nouns: that is to say, any mutable vowel, situated at some distance from the accent, will be rejected: while any perfect vowel being deprived of the accent, and followed immediately by a consonant, will be changed for its correspondent imperfect one. But, as a table will make all plain, we shall give one with the regular triliteral verb: those which are subject to any defect will receive these affixes according to the same model.

222. Table of the Abbreviated Pronouns as attached to Verbs.

SINGULAR.

Pers.	Forms proper for the Preterite Tense.	Do. for the Present.
1 com.	נִי־ — נִי־	—נִי
2 masc.	—ךָ, *in pausa* —ךָ or —ךָ	—ךָ or —כָה
2 fem.	—ךְ . . . . —ךְ — —ךְ	—ךְ — —ךְ or —כִי
3 masc.	—הוּ . . . . —וֹ —	—הוּ — —וֹ
3 fem.	—הּ . . . . —הּ — —הָ	—הָ

PLURAL.

1 com.	—נוּ — נוּ	—נוּ
2 masc.	—כֶם	—כֶם
2 fem.	—כֶן	—כֶן
3 masc.	—ם — ם־, *poeticè* —מוֹ	—ם — ם־, *poeticè* —מוֹ
3 fem.	—ן — ן	—ן

2d, *Affixes of the Present, when preceded by an Epenthetic Nún.*

SINGULAR.

1 com.	־נִי ־נִי	for ־נְנִי
2 masc.	־נְךָ ־כָה	־נְךָ
3 masc.	־נּוּ	for ־נְהוּ
3 fem.	־נָהּ ־נָהּ	־נְהָ

EXAMPLES OF THE THIRD PERSON SINGULAR PRETERITE OF THE VERB, WITH ITS VARIOUS AFFIXED PRONOUNS.

פְּקָדַנִי *he visited me;* פְּקָדָנוּ — *us;* פְּקָדְךָ — *thee,* m., פְּקָדֵךְ — *thee,* f.; פְּקָדְכֶם — *you,* m., פְּקָדְכֶן — *you,* f.; פְּקָדָהוּ, or contr. פְּקָדוֹ — *him,* פְּקָדָהּ — *her;* פְּקָדָם, poeticè פְּקָדָמוֹ — *them,* m., פְּקָדָן — *them,* f.

Third Person Singular Feminine.

פְּקָדַתְנִי *she visited me,* com.; פְּקָדַתְנוּ — *us,* com.; פְּקָדַתְךָ — *thee,* m., פְּקָדַתְךְ — *thee,* f.; פְּקָדַתְכֶם — *you,* m., פְּקָדַתְכֶן — *you,* f.; פְּקָדַתְהוּ or פְּקָדָתוּ — *him,* פְּקָדַתְהָ or פְּקָדָתָה — *her;* פְּקָדַתָם — *them,* m., פְּקָדַתָן — *them,* f.

Second Person Masculine.

פְּקַדְתַנִי *thou visitedst me,* com.; פְּקַדְתָנוּ — *us,* com.; פְּקַדְתָהוּ or פְּקַדְתּוֹ — *him,* פְּקַדְתָהּ — *her;* פְּקַדְתֶם — *them,* m., פְּקַדְתֶן — *them,* f.

Second Person Feminine.

פְּקַדְתִנִי — *thou* (fem.) *visitedst me,* com.; פְּקַדְתָנוּ — *us,* com.; פְּקַדְתִיהוּ or פְּקַדְתִיוּ — *him,* פְּקַדְתִיהָ — *her;* פְּקַדְתִים *them,* m., פְּקַדְתִין *them,* f.

First Person Singular Com.

פְּקָדַתִּיךְ *I visited thee,* m., פְּקָדַתִּיךְ — *thee,* f.; פְּקָדַתִּיכֶם — *you,* m., פְּקָדַתִּיכֶן — *you,* f.; פְּקָדַתִּיהוּ or פְּקָדַתִּיו — *him,* פְּקָדַתִּיהָ — *her;* פְּקָדַתִּים — *them,* m., פְּקָדַתִּין — *them,* f.

Third Person Plural Com.

פְּקָדוּנִי *they visited me,* com.; פְּקָדוּנוּ — *us,* com.; פְּקָדוּךְ — *thee,* m., פְּקָדוּךְ *thee,* f.; פְּקָדוּכֶם — *you,* m., פְּקָדוּכֶן — *you,* f.; פְּקָדוּהוּ — *him,* פְּקָדוּהָ — *her;* פְּקָדוּם — *them,* m., or, poeticè פְּקָדוּמוֹ, פְּקָדוּן *them,* f.

Second Person Plural Com.

פְּקַדְתּוּנִי *ye* (com.) *visited me;* פְּקַדְתּוּנוּ — *us,* com.; פְּקַדְתּוּהוּ — *him,* פְּקַדְתּוּהָ — *her;* פְּקַדְתּוּם — *them,* m., פְּקַדְתּוּן — *them,* f.

First Person Plural Com.

פְּקַדְנוּךְ *we* (com.) *visited thee,* m.; פְּקַדְנוּךְ — *thee,* f.; פְּקַדְנוּכֶם — *you,* m., פְּקַדְנוּכֶן — *you,* f.; פְּקַדְנוּהוּ — *him,* פְּקַדְנוּהָ — *her;* פְּקַדְנוּם — *them,* m., פְּקַדְנוּן — *them,* f.

EXAMPLES OF THE PRESENT TENSE, WITH THE AFFIXED PRONOUNS.

Third Person Singular Masc.

יִפְקְדֵנִי *he visits me,* com.; יִפְקְדֵנוּ — *us,* com.; יִפְקָדֵךְ — *thee,* m., יִפְקָדֵךְ — *thee,* f.; יִפְקָדֵכֶם — *you,* m., יִפְקָדֵכֶן — *you,* f.; יִפְקְדֵהוּ or יִפְקְדֵוּ — *him,* יִפְקְדֶנָּה or יִפְקְדֶהָ — *her;* יִפְקְדֵם — *them,* m., or, poeticè יִפְקְדֵמוֹ, יִפְקְדֵן — *them,* f.; and so throughout.

Remarks.

223. It will be seen by the Table, that every possible combination of the verb with the pronoun thus affixed is not made: *I visited myself, thou visitedst thyself,* and the like, would rather fall under the province of one of the reciprocal species: as, נִפְקַדְתִּי, or הִתְפַּקַּדְתִּי in *Niphḥál* or *Hithpāḥél,* and would not, therefore, be made in *Kal* by affixing the pronouns: but, which of these species is to be adopted, custom alone can determine. We have, nevertheless, a very few examples in which this combination is made in *Kal:* as, אֲנִי עָשִׂיתִנִי *I have made myself,* or, *for myself,* Ezek. xxix. 3, in which the repetition of the pronoun seems to add some emphasis to the passage.

2d, With respect to the vowels of the root, it will immediately be perceived, that they are subject to the same laws which prevail in the nouns, when receiving similar additions. In the *asyllabic* affixes, for example, as the last consonant of the root must be taken in order to commence the syllable, the preceding vowel must either be perfect, or rejected. But, neither of the vowels of the root in *Kal* is immutable; and, as the first is the farthest removed from the accent, it is rejected as in the nouns; and we have פָּקָדַנִי just as we have דִּבְּרִי (Art. 161. 2.). In like manner, when the affix is *syllabic,* we have the first vowel rejected, and the second made *imperfect,* as often as the accent is with the affix: as, פְּקָדְכֶם, just as we have דִּבַּרְכֶם in the nouns. This necessarily holds good in the Present tense, the Imperative, Infinitive, and Participles; as also in all the other species *Niphḥál, Pīḥél,* &c. as well as the defective verbs, nouns, and participles, respect being duly had to the etymology of the words.

3d, In a few instances, the affix of the first person has (ר) instead of (נ): as, עָנָנִי *he hath heard me,* Ps. cxviii. 5; בְּזָחָנִי *thou hast despised me,* 2 Sam. xii. 10. But in the last case this seems to have been brought about by the influence of the accent (Art. 130. 5.).

4th, For the feminine affix ךָ we sometimes have ךְ: as, קָרָאֲךְ *he hath called thee* (fem.), Is. liv. 6. So חִבָּרְאֲךְ *thy being created,* Ezek. xxviii. 15, which are generally thought to be Chaldaisms. In the last case, however, the pause-accent will be sufficient to account for the anomaly (Art. 130. 5.).

5th, When, however, the accent is, on any occasion, drawn back,

the vowel accompanying the affix will necessarily be imperfect: as, אֲהֵבַתְךְ *she hath loved thee* (fem.); גְּנָבַתָם *she hath stolen them*, &c.

6th, It should also be observed, that whenever the root ends in either ה or יִ— by the process of conjugation, &c. the affixes are simply added: as, פָּקְדוּנִי without any previous vowel or *Shĕvá;* and, that when the affixes are found both in the syllabic, and asyllabic, forms, the syllabic must be taken in these cases: as, פָּקְדוּהָ, not פְּקָדוּתַּהוּ *they visited her;* פָּקְדוּהוּ, not פְּקָדוּוֹ *they visited him.* The reason is obvious: one vowel following another will remain unutterable; and, in order to avoid this, a consonant must be introduced.

7th, In פָּקַדְתָּ the terminating vowel gives place to the vowel of the affix: as, פְּקַדְתַּנִי *thou visitedst me.*

8th, The form פָּקַדְתָּ is found in a few instances with the pronominal affixes: as, הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנוּ *thou* (fem.) *hast adjured us*, Josh. ii. 17, 20: but, most frequently, the form פָּקַדְתִּי is taken (see Art. 201. 24.): as, פְּקַדְתִּינִי; and, without יִ, פְּקַדְתְּנִי *thou* (fem.) *hast visited me.* When this is the case, it must be determined by the context alone, whether the verb is of the first or second person. In a few cases also, (ֵ) takes the place of (ַ): as, הוֹרַדְתֵּנוּ *thou* (fem.) *hast caused us to descend*, Josh. ii. 18.

9th, The second persons masculine and feminine plural take the forms פְּקַדְתּוּ, instead of פְּקַדְתֶּם or תֶּן— before the affixed pronouns: as, פְּקַדְתּוּנִי *ye* (com.) *visited me.* In this case, the conjugated pronoun seems to be of the Chaldaic form אַתּוּן *you*, instead of the Hebrew one אַתֶּם or אַתֶּן.

On the Vowels of the Present Tense, Imperative, Infinitive, and Participles.

224. As the terminating vowel of the Present tense is mutable in the regular triliteral verb in *Kal,* it will be rejected upon receiving any asyllabic affix: as, יִפְקְדֵנִי *he visits me;* but, when the affix is syllabic, it will be changed for its correspondent imperfect vowel: as, יִפְקָדֵךְ *he visits thee*, &c. due regard being had to the vowel as determined by usage: i. e. whether it be (וֹ) (-), (ֵ), or (ֶ), and to the following consonant, whether it be guttural or not.

In a few instances, the vowels proper for the affixes of the preterite

are found with those of the present: as, יַשְׂבִּיעֵנִי *he will fill me*, Job ix. 18; יַכִּירֵנוּ *he will acknowledge us*, Is. lxiii. 16; נַכֶּם *we will strike* or *pierce them*, Num. xxi. 30, &c. And, *vice versâ*, those proper for the present with the preterite; as, יִסְּרַנִי *he hath corrected me*, Isa. viii. 11.

2d, These observations will apply to the affixing of the pronouns to the present tenses of verbs of every species and sort.

3d, In the Imperatives, however, as they receive no preformatives, the vowels will be regulated as they are in the nouns (which in reality the Imperatives all are): and, as the form proper for construction will take the affixed pronouns, the ultimate or penultimate vowels alone can be subject to change, as in the nouns: e. g. שְׁלָחֵנִי *send me*, from שְׁלַח *send*: שִׁמְעוּנִי *hear ye me*, from שִׁמְעוּ *hear*. So דָּעֵהוּ *know thou him*, from דַּע.

4th, Those terminating in (וֹ) are thought to be subject to a transposition: as, שָׁמְרֵנִי *keep thou me*, from שְׁמֹר. I am inclined to believe, however, that שָׁמְרִי is the primitive word taken in these cases, just as פָּקְדִי seems to be in the forms פִּקְדִי *visit thou* (fem.), and פָּקְדוּ *visit ye* (masc.), whence we shall regularly have שָׁמְרֵנִי, &c.

5th, The Infinitives are subject to the same general laws with the Imperatives of *Kal*, and which also prevail in every species of the Segolate nouns, i. e. we must enquire in the first place, what form of the primitive has been taken, and then add our affixes, &c. just as the augments are added to those nouns. Examples: מָלְכוֹ *his reigning*, from מִלְכָה, or rather מִלְכָה; רָדְפִי *my persecuting*, from רִדְפָה or רִדְפָה. So מָאָסְכֶם for מֵאֲסְכֶם (Art. 112. 2.) *your spurning*, from מֵאָס or מָאֹס; קָרְבָתָם, for קִרְבַתָם *your drawing near*, from קִרְבָה or קָרֵב. Sometimes obliquely (Art. 102. 2.): as, קָצְרָכֶם *your reaping*, from קְצִיר or קָצַר.

6th, It may be observed that, with the affixes –הּ, –כֶם, and –כֶן, both forms are found: as, אֲכָלְךָ *thy eating*, Gen. ii. 17; אֲכָלְכֶם *your eating*, Gen. iii. 5; שָׁמְעֲךָ *thy hearing*, 2 Sam. v. 24; שָׁמְעֲכֶם *your hearing*, Josh. vi. 5. But, it seldom happens that the same word is found in both forms: which seems to shew, that in one case, one primitive form has been preferred, and in another, another.

7th, Infinitives of other forms are subject to the general laws which prevail in nouns of the same forms.

8th, Nothing need be said on the manner in which the participles receive the pronominal affixes. They are nothing more than nouns, and are, therefore, subject to the same variations which are found to prevail in them.

On the mode of affixing the Pronouns to the different parts of the Defective Verbs.

225. It will not be necessary to detain the Student long on this subject. He will only have to bear in mind, what has been laid down in our Canons on the mutable and quiescent characters of the letters אהוי —on נ, as being occasionally rejected —on roots, having the second and third radical letter the same, and occasionally losing one, which will, however, return, whenever circumstances will allow it, under the form of *Dāgésh forte* —and on the vowels, as being regulated according to the occurrence of gutturals, the addition of syllabic, or asyllabic augments, and the like; all of which has been abundantly exemplified in the preceding sheets. We shall now, therefore, take our leave of this subject, and proceed to lay down tables, shewing the full conjugations of the different kinds of verbs, in further illustration of the rules detailed and exemplified in our present, and preceding Lecture.

The following Table is taken from the "Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache" of Dr. Gesenius, with some slight alterations.

Paradigm of Verbs in KAL.

	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb. 3 gutt.	Verb. ע init.	Verb. ד״
PRETER.						
Sing. 3 m.	קָטַל	עָמַד	זָעַק	שָׁמַע	נָגַשׁ	סַב
3 f.	קָטְלָה	עָמְדָה	זָעֲקָה	שָׁמְעָה	נָגְשָׁה	סַבָּה
2 m.	קָטַלְתָּ	עָמַדְתָּ	זָעַקְתָּ	שָׁמַעְתָּ	נָגַשְׁתָּ	סַבּוֹתָ
2 f.	קָטַלְתְּ	עָמַדְתְּ	זָעַקְתְּ	שָׁמַעְתְּ	נָגַשְׁתְּ	סַבּוֹת
1	קָטַלְתִּי	עָמַדְתִּי	זָעַקְתִּי	שָׁמַעְתִּי	נָגַשְׁתִּי	סַבּוֹתִי
Plur. 3	קָטְלוּ	עָמְדוּ	זָעֲקוּ	שָׁמְעוּ	נָגְשׁוּ	סַבּוּ
2 m.	קְטַלְתֶּם	עֲמַדְתֶּם	זְעַקְתֶּם	שְׁמַעְתֶּם	נְגַשְׁתֶּם	סַבּוֹתֶם
2 f.	קְטַלְתֶּן	עֲמַדְתֶּן	זְעַקְתֶּן	שְׁמַעְתֶּן	נְגַשְׁתֶּן	סַבּוֹתֶן
1	קָטַלְנוּ	עָמַדְנוּ	זָעַקְנוּ	שָׁמַעְנוּ	נָגַשְׁנוּ	סַבּוֹנוּ
INF. abs.	קָטוֹל	עָמוֹד	זָעוֹק	שָׁמוֹעַ	נָגוֹשׁ	סָבוֹב
INF. const.	קְטֹל	עֲמֹד	זְעֹק	שְׁמֹעַ	גֶּשֶׁת	סְבֹב
IMPERATIVE.						
Sing. m.	קְטֹל	עֲמֹד	זְעַק	שְׁמַע	גַּשׁ	סְבֹב
f.	קִטְלִי	עִמְדִי	זַעֲקִי	שִׁמְעִי	גְּשִׁי	סֹבִּי
Plur. m.	קִטְלוּ	עִמְדוּ	זַעֲקוּ	שִׁמְעוּ	גְּשׁוּ	סֹבּוּ
f.	קְטֹלְנָה	עֲמֹדְנָה	זְעַקְנָה	שְׁמַעְנָה	גַּשְׁנָה	סֻבֶּינָה
PRESENT.						
Sing. 3 m.	יִקְטֹל	יַעֲמֹד	יִזְעַק	יִשְׁמַע	יִגַּשׁ	יָסֹב
3 f.	תִּקְטֹל	תַּעֲמֹד	תִּזְעַק	תִּשְׁמַע	תִּגַּשׁ	תָּסֹב
2 m.	תִּקְטֹל	תַּעֲמֹד	תִּזְעַק	תִּשְׁמַע	תִּגַּשׁ	תָּסֹב
2 f.	תִּקְטְלִי	תַּעַמְדִי	תִּזְעֲקִי	תִּשְׁמְעִי	תִּגְּשִׁי	תָּסֹבִּי
1	אֶקְטֹל	אֶעֱמֹד	אֶזְעַק	אֶשְׁמַע	אֶגַּשׁ	אָסֹב
Plur. 3 m.	יִקְטְלוּ	יַעַמְדוּ	יִזְעֲקוּ	יִשְׁמְעוּ	יִגְּשׁוּ	יָסֹבּוּ
3 f.	תִּקְטֹלְנָה	תַּעֲמֹדְנָה	תִּזְעַקְנָה	תִּשְׁמַעְנָה	תִּגַּשְׁנָה	תָּסֻבֶּינָה
2 m.	תִּקְטְלוּ	תַּעַמְדוּ	תִּזְעֲקוּ	תִּשְׁמְעוּ	תִּגְּשׁוּ	תָּסֹבּוּ
2 f.	תִּקְטֹלְנָה	תַּעֲמֹדְנָה	תִּזְעַקְנָה	תִּשְׁמַעְנָה	תִּגַּשְׁנָה	תָּסֻבֶּינָה
1	נִקְטֹל	נַעֲמֹד	נִזְעַק	נִשְׁמַע	נִגַּשׁ	נָסֹב
PRES. apoc.	—	—	—	—	—	—
PART. act.	קֹטֵל	עֹמֵד	זֹעֵק	שֹׁמֵעַ	נֹגֵשׁ	סֹבֵב
pass.	קָטוּל	עָמוּד	זָעוּק	שָׁמוּעַ	נָגוּשׁ	סָבוּב

Paradigm of Verbs in KAL.

Verb. ה final.	Verb. א init.	Verb. נ med.	Verb. ו med.	Verb. ו init.	Verb. י init.	Verb. א init.
גָּלָה	מָצָא	בָּן	קָם	יָטַב	יָשַׁב	אָכַל
גָּלְתָה	מָצְאָה		קָמָה			
גָּלִיתָ	מָצָאתָ		קַמְתָּ			
גָּלִית	מָצָאת		קַמְתְּ			
גָּלִיתִי	מָצָאתִי		קַמְתִּי			
גָּלָה	מָצָא	like קָם	קָמוּ			
גָּלִיתֶם	מְצָאתֶם		קַמְתֶּם			
גָּלִיתֶן	מְצָאתֶן		קַמְתֶּן			
גָּלִינוּ	מָצָאנוּ		קָמְנוּ			

גָּלָה	מָצָא	בָּן	קוֹם	יָטוֹב	יָשׁוֹב	אָכוֹל
גָּלוֹת	מְצֹא	בִּין	קוּם	יְטֹב	שֶׁבֶת	אֱכֹל
גָּלֵה	מְצָא	בִּין	קוּם		יָרֵשׁ שֵׁב	אֱכֹל
גָּלִי	מִצְאִי	בִּינִי	קוּמִי		יְרָשִׁי שְׁבִי	אִכְלִי
גְּלוּ	מִצְאוּ	בִּינוּ	קוּמוּ	none.	יְרָשׁוּ שְׁבוּ	אִכְלוּ
גְּלֹנָה	מְצֶאנָה	—	לְמֹנָה		יְרַשְׁנָה שְׁבְנָה	אֱכֹלְנָה

יִגְלֶה	יִמְצָא	יָבִין	יָקוּם	יִיטַב	יֵשֵׁב	יֹאכַל
תִּגְלֶה	תִּמְצָא	תָּבִין	תָּקוּם	תִּיטַב	תֵּשֵׁב	תֹּאכַל
תִּגְלֶה	תִּמְצָא	תָּבִין	תָּקוּם	תִּיטַב	תֵּשֵׁב	תֹּאכַל
תִּגְלִי	תִּמְצְאִי	תָּבִינִי	תָּקוּמִי	תִּיטְבִי	תֵּשְׁבִי	תֹּאכְלִי
אֶגְלֶה	אֶמְצָא	אָבִין	אָקוּם	אִיטַב	אֵשֵׁב	אֹכַל
יִגְלוּ	יִמְצְאוּ	יָבִינוּ	יָקוּמוּ	יִיטְבוּ	יֵשְׁבוּ	יֹאכְלוּ
תִּגְלֶינָה	תִּמְצֶאנָה	—	תָּקוּמְנָה	תִּיטַבְנָה	תֵּשַׁבְנָה	תֹּאכַלְנָה
תִּגְלוּ	תִּמְצְאוּ	תָּבִינוּ	תָּקוּמוּ	תִּיטְבוּ	תֵּשְׁבוּ	תֹּאכְלוּ
תִּגְלֶינָה	תִּמְצֶאנָה	—	תָּקוּמְנָה	תִּיטַבְנָה	תֵּשַׁבְנָה	תֹּאכַלְנָה
נִגְלֶה	נִמְצָא	נָבִין	נָקוּם	נִיטַב	נֵשֵׁב	נֹאכַל
יִגֶל		יָבֶן	יָקָם			
גְּלֵה	מְצָא	בֵּן	קָם	יְטַב	שֵׁב	אֱכֹל
גְּלִי	מִצְאִי		קוּם	יְטִב	שְׁבִי	אִכְלִי
				יְטֹב	יָשׁוֹב	אָכוֹל

Paradigm of Verbs in NIPHḤAL.

PRETER.	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb. 3 gutt.	Verb. נ init.	Verb. דל
Sing. 3 m.	נִקְטַל	נֶעֱמַד	נִזְעַק	נִשְׁמַע	נִגַּשׁ	נָסַב
3 f.	נִקְטְלָה	נֶעֶמְדָה	נִזְעֲקָה	נִשְׁמְעָה	נִגְּשָׁה	נָסַבָּה
2 m.	נִקְטַלְתָּ	נֶעֱמַדְתָּ	נִזְעַקְתָּ	נִשְׁמַעְתָּ	נִגַּשְׁתָּ	נָסַבּוֹתָ
2 f.	נִקְטַלְתְּ	נֶעֱמַדְתְּ	נִזְעַקְתְּ	נִשְׁמַעַתְּ	נִגַּשְׁתְּ	נָסַבּוֹת
1	נִקְטַלְתִּי	נֶעֱמַדְתִּי	נִזְעַקְתִּי	נִשְׁמַעְתִּי	נִגַּשְׁתִּי	נָסַבּוֹתִי
Plur. 3	נִקְטְלוּ	נֶעֶמְדוּ	נִזְעֲקוּ	נִשְׁמְעוּ	נִגְּשׁוּ	נָסַבּוּ
2 m.	נִקְטַלְתֶּם	נֶעֱמַדְתֶּם	נִזְעַקְתֶּם	נִשְׁמַעְתֶּם	נִגַּשְׁתֶּם	נָסַבּוֹתֶם
2 f.	נִקְטַלְתֶּן	נֶעֱמַדְתֶּן	נִזְעַקְתֶּן	נִשְׁמַעְתֶּן	נִגַּשְׁתֶּן	נָסַבּוֹתֶן
1	נִקְטַלְנוּ	נֶעֱמַדְנוּ	נִזְעַקְנוּ	נִשְׁמַעְנוּ	נִגַּשְׁנוּ	נָסַבּוֹנוּ
INFINITIVE.	הִקָּטֵל	הֵעָמֵד	הִזָּעֵק	הִשָּׁמַע	הִגָּשׁ	הִסָּב
IMPERATIVE.						
Sing. m.	הִקָּטֵל	הֵעָמֵד	הִזָּעֵק	הִשָּׁמַע	הִגָּשׁ	הִסָּב
f.	הִקָּטְלִי	הֵעָמְדִי	הִזָּעֲקִי	הִשָּׁמְעִי	הִגָּשְׁנִי	הִסַּבִּי
Plur. m.	הִקָּטְלוּ	הֵעָמְדוּ	הִזָּעֲקוּ	הִשָּׁמְעוּ	הִגָּשְׁנוּ	הִסַּבּוּ
f.	הִקָּטֵלְנָה	הֵעָמַדְנָה	הִזָּעַקְנָה	הִשָּׁמַעְנָה	הִגָּשְׁנָה	הִסַּבֶּינָה
PRESENT.						
Sing. 3. m.	יִקָּטֵל	יֵעָמֵד	יִזָּעֵק	יִשָּׁמַע	יִגָּשׁ	יִסַּב
3 f.	תִּקָּטֵל	תֵּעָמֵד	תִּזָּעֵק	תִּשָּׁמַע	תִּגָּשׁ	תִּסַּב
2 m.	תִּקָּטֵל	תֵּעָמֵד	תִּזָּעֵק	תִּשָּׁמַע	תִּגָּשׁ	תִּסַּב
2 f.	תִּקָּטְלִי	תֵּעָמְדִי	תִּזָּעֲקִי	תִּשָּׁמְעִי	תִּגָּשְׁנִי	תִּסַּבִּי
1	אֶקָּטֵל	אֵעָמֵד	אִזָּעֵק	אֶשָּׁמַע	אִגָּשׁ	אֶסַּב
Plur. 3 m.	יִקָּטְלוּ	יֵעָמְדוּ	יִזָּעֲקוּ	יִשָּׁמְעוּ	יִגָּשְׁנוּ	יִסַּבּוּ
3 f.	תִּקָּטֵלְנָה	תֵּעָמַדְנָה	תִּזָּעַקְנָה	תִּשָּׁמַעְנָה	תִּגָּשְׁנָה	תִּסַּבֶּינָה
2 m.	תִּקָּטְלוּ	תֵּעָמְדוּ	תִּזָּעֲקוּ	תִּשָּׁמְעוּ	תִּגָּשְׁנוּ	תִּסַּבּוּ
2 f.	תִּקָּטֵלְנָה	תֵּעָמַדְנָה	תִּזָּעַקְנָה	תִּשָּׁמַעְנָה	תִּגָּשְׁנָה	תִּסַּבֶּינָה
1	נִקָּטֵל	נֵעָמֵד	נִזָּעֵק	נִשָּׁמַע	נִגָּשׁ	נִסַּב
PRES. apoc.	—	—	—	—	—	—
PARTICIPLE.	נִקְטָל	נֶעֱמָד	נִזְעָק	נִשְׁמָע	נִגָּשׁ	נָסָב

Paradigm of Verbs in NIPHḤAL.

Verb. ה final.	Verb. א final.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ע init.	Verb. א init.
נִגְלָה	נִמְצָא	נָבוֹן	נָקוֹם	נוֹשַׁב	נֶאֱכַל
נִגְלְתָה	נִמְצֵאת		נָקוֹמָה	נוֹשְׁבָה	
נִגְלֵיתָ	נִמְצֵאתָ	like נָקוֹם	נְקוּמוֹתָ	נוֹשַׁבְתָּ	like first lett. gutt.
נִגְלֵית	נִמְצֵאת		נְקוּמוֹת	נוֹשַׁבְתְּ	
נִגְלֵיתִי	נִמְצֵאתִי		נְקוּמוֹתִי	נוֹשַׁבְתִּי	
נִגְלָה	נִמְצָא		נָקוּמוּ	נוֹשְׁבוּ	
נִגְלֵיתֶם	נִמְצֵאתֶם		נְקוּמוֹתֶם	נוֹשַׁבְתֶּם	
נִגְלֵיתֶן	נִמְצֵאתֶן		נְקוּמוֹתֶן	נוֹשַׁבְתֶּן	
נִגְלוּ	נִמְצְאוּ		נְקוּמוּ	נוֹשְׁבוּ	
הִגָּלוֹת	הִמָּצֵא	הִבּוֹן	הִקּוֹם	הִנָּשֵׁב	הֵאָכֵל
הִגָּלֵה	הִמָּצֵא	הִבּוֹן	הִקּוֹם	הִנָּשֵׁב	הֵאָכֵל
הִגָּלִי	הִמָּצְאִי	like נָקוֹם	הִקּוֹמִי	הִנָּשְׁבִי	
הִגָּלוּ	הִמָּצְאוּ		הִקּוֹמוּ	הִנָּשְׁבוּ	
הִגָּלְיָה	הִמָּצֵאנָה		הִקּוֹמְנָה	הִנָּשֵׁבְנָה	
יִגָּלֶה	יִמָּצֵא	יִבּוֹן	יָקוֹם	יִנָּשֵׁב	יֵאָכֵל
תִּגָּלֶה	תִּמָּצֵא		תָּקוֹם	תִּנָּשֵׁב	as יִנָּשֵׁב
תִּגָּלֶה	תִּמָּצֵא	like the last.	תָּקוֹם	תִּנָּשֵׁב	
תִּגָּלִי	תִּמָּצְאִי		תָּקוֹמִי	תִּנָּשְׁבִי	
אֶגָּלֶה	אֶמָּצֵא		אָקוֹם	אִנָּשֵׁב	
יִגָּלוּ	יִמָּצְאוּ		יָקוֹמוּ	יִנָּשְׁבוּ	
תִּגָּלֶינָה	תִּמָּצֵאנָה		תָּקוֹמְנָה	תִּנָּשֵׁבְנָה	
תִּגָּלוּ	תִּמָּצְאוּ		תָּקוֹמוּ	תִּנָּשְׁבוּ	
תִּגָּלֶינָה	תִּמָּצֵאנָה		תָּקוֹמְנָה	תִּנָּשֵׁבְנָה	
נִגָּלֶה	נִמְצָא	נָבוֹן	נָקוֹם	נִנָּשֵׁב	נֵאָכֵל
יִגָּל					
נִגְלָה	נִמְצָא	נָבוֹן	נָקוֹם	נוֹשַׁב	נֵאָכֵל

Paradigm of Verbs in Pihel.

	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb. 3 gutt.	Verb. ל init.	Verb דּ. פּוֹדֵד.
PRETER.						
Sing. 3 m.	קִטֵּל	עִמֵּד	בֵּרֵךְ	שִׁמַּע	נִגַּשׁ	סוֹבֵב
3 f.	קִטְּלָה		בֵּרְכָה	שִׁמְּעָה		סוֹבְבָה
2 m.	קִטַּלְתָּ	regular.	בֵּרַכְתָּ	שִׁמַּעְתָּ	regular.	סוֹבַבְתָּ
2 f.	קִטַּלְתְּ		בֵּרַכְתְּ	שִׁמַּעְתְּ		סוֹבַבְתְּ
1	קִטַּלְתִּי		בֵּרַכְתִּי	שִׁמַּעְתִּי		סוֹבַבְתִּי
Plur. 3	קִטְּלוּ		בֵּרְכוּ	שִׁמְּעוּ		סוֹבְבוּ
2 m.	קִטַּלְתֶּם		בֵּרַכְתֶּם	שִׁמַּעְתֶּם		סוֹבַבְתֶּם
2 f.	קִטַּלְתֶּן		בֵּרַכְתֶּן	שִׁמַּעְתֶּן		סוֹבַבְתֶּן
1	קִטַּלְנוּ		בֵּרַכְנוּ	שִׁמַּעְנוּ		סוֹבַבְנוּ
INFINITIVE.	קַטֵּל	עַמֵּד	בָּרֵךְ	שַׁמֵּעַ	נַגֵּשׁ	סוֹבֵב
IMPERATIVE.						
Sing. m.	קַטֵּל	עַמֵּד	בָּרֵךְ	שַׁמַּע	נַגֵּשׁ	סוֹבֵב
f.	קַטְּלִי	reg.	בָּרְכִי	שַׁמְּעִי	&c.	סוֹבְבִי
Plur. m.	קַטְּלוּ		בָּרְכוּ	שַׁמְּעוּ		סוֹבְבוּ
f.	קַטֵּלְנָה		בָּרֵכְנָה	שַׁמַּעְנָה		סוֹבַבְנָה
PRESENT.						
Sing. 3 m.	יְקַטֵּל	יְעַמֵּד	יְבָרֵךְ	יְשַׁמַּע	יְנַגֵּשׁ	יְסוֹבֵב
3 f.	תְּקַטֵּל		תְּבָרֵךְ	תְּשַׁמַּע	&c.	תְּסוֹבֵב
2 m.	תְּקַטֵּל	regular.	תְּבָרֵךְ	תְּשַׁמַּע		תְּסוֹבֵב
2 f.	תְּקַטְּלִי		תְּבָרְכִי	תְּשַׁמְּעִי		תְּסוֹבְבִי
1	אֲקַטֵּל		אֲבָרֵךְ	אֲשַׁמַּע		אֲסוֹבֵב
Plur. 3 m.	יְקַטְּלוּ		יְבָרְכוּ	יְשַׁמְּעוּ		יְסוֹבְבוּ
3 f.	תְּקַטֵּלְנָה		תְּבָרֵכְנָה	תְּשַׁמַּעְנָה		תְּסוֹבַבְנָה
2 m.	תְּקַטְּלוּ		תְּבָרְכוּ	תְּשַׁמְּעוּ		תְּסוֹבְבוּ
2 f.	תְּקַטֵּלְנָה		תְּבָרֵכְנָה	תְּשַׁמַּעְנָה		תְּסוֹבַבְנָה
1	נְקַטֵּל		נְבָרֵךְ	נְשַׁמַּע		נְסוֹבֵב
PRES. apoc.						
PARTICIPLE.	מְקַטֵּל	מְעַמֵּד	מְבָרֵךְ	מְשַׁמַּע	מְנַגֵּשׁ	מְסוֹבֵב

Paradigm of Verbs in PIHEL.

Verb. ל final.	Verb. ע final.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ע or ע init.	Verb. א init.
גִּלָּה	מִצֵּא	בּוֹנֵן	קוֹמֵם	יִטֵּב	אִבֵּל
גִּלְּתָה	מִצְּאָה		קוֹמְמָה		
גִּלִּיתָ	מִצֵּאתָ	like the last.	קוֹמַמְתָּ	regular.	regular.
גִּלִּית	מִצֵּאת		קוֹמַמְתְּ		
גִּלִּיתִי	מִצֵּאתִי		קוֹמַמְתִּי		
גִּלָּה	מִצְּאוּ		קוֹמְמוּ		
גִּלִּיתֶם	מִצֵּאתֶם		קוֹמַמְתֶּם		
גִּלִּיתֶן	מִצֵּאתֶן		קוֹמַמְתֶּן		
גִּלִּינוּ	מִצֵּאנוּ		קוֹמַמְנוּ		
גִּלְּתָה	מִצְּאָה	בּוֹנֵן	קוֹמֵם	יִטֵּב	אִבֵּל
גִּלָּה	מִצֵּא	בּוֹנֵן	קוֹמֵם	יִטֵּב	אִבֵּל
גַּלִּי	מַצְּאִי		קוֹמְמִי		
גַּלּוּ	מַצְּאוּ	&c.	קוֹמְמוּ	&c.	&c.
גַּלִּינָה	מַצֵּאנָה		קוֹמַמְנָה		
יְגַלֶּה	יְמַצֵּא	יְבוֹנֵן	יְקוֹמֵם	יְיַטֵּב	יְאַבֵּל
תְּגַלֶּה	תְּמַצֵּא		תְּקוֹמֵם		
תְּגַלֶּה	תְּמַצֵּא	&c.	תְּקוֹמֵם	&c.	&c.
תְּגַלִּי	תְּמַצְּאִי		תְּקוֹמְמִי		
אֲגַלֶּה	אֲמַצֵּא		אֲקוֹמֵם		
יְגַלּוּ	יְמַצְּאוּ		יְקוֹמְמוּ		
תְּגַלֶּינָה	תְּמַצֵּאנָה		תְּקוֹמַמְנָה		
תְּגַלּוּ	תְּמַצְּאוּ		תְּקוֹמְמוּ		
תְּגַלֶּינָה	תְּמַצֵּאנָה		תְּקוֹמַמְנָה		
נְגַלֶּה	נְמַצֵּא		נְקוֹמֵם		
יְגַל					
מְגַלֶּה	מְמַצֵּא	מְבוֹנֵן	מְקוֹמֵם	מְיַטֵּב	מְאַבֵּל

Paradigm of Verbs in Puhal.

	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb. 3 gutt.	Verb. ל init.	Verb. ד"ל
PRETER.						
Sing. 3 m.	חָמַל	עָמַד	בֹּרַךְ	שֻׁמַּע	נֻגַּשׁ	סוֹבַב
3 f.	חָמְלָה		בֹּרְכָה	שֻׁמְּעָה		סוֹבְבָה
2 m.	חָמַלְתָּ	regular.	בֹּרַכְתָּ	שֻׁמַּעְתָּ	regular.	סוֹבַבְתָּ
2 f.	חָמַלְתְּ		בֹּרַכְתְּ	שֻׁמַּעַתְּ		סוֹבַבְתְּ
1	חָמַלְתִּי		בֹּרַכְתִּי	שֻׁמַּעְתִּי		סוֹבַבְתִּי
Plur. 3	חָמְלוּ		בֹּרְכוּ	שֻׁמְּעוּ		סוֹבְבוּ
2 m.	חֲמַלְתֶּם		בֹּרַכְתֶּם	שֻׁמַּעְתֶּם		סוֹבַבְתֶּם
2 f.	חֲמַלְתֶּן		בֹּרַכְתֶּן	שֻׁמַּעְתֶּן		סוֹבַבְתֶּן
1	חָמַלְנוּ		בֹּרַכְנוּ	שֻׁמַּעְנוּ		סוֹבַבְנוּ
INFINITIVE.	חָמַל	עָמַד	בֹּרַךְ	שֻׁמַּע	נֻגַּשׁ	סוֹבַב
IMPERATIVE. Sing. m. f. Plur. m. f.	None.					
PRESENT.						
Sing. 3 m.	יְחָמַל	יְעָמַד	יְבֹרַךְ	יְשֻׁמַּע	יְנֻגַּשׁ	יְסוֹבַב
3 f.	תְּחָמַל		תְּבֹרַךְ	תְּשֻׁמַּע		תְּסוֹבַב
2 m.	תְּחָמַל	&c.	תְּבֹרַךְ	תְּשֻׁמַּע	&c.	תְּסוֹבַב
2 f.	תְּחָמְלִי		תְּבֹרְכִי	תְּשֻׁמְּעִי		תְּסוֹבְבִי
1	אֶחָמַל		אֲבֹרַךְ	אֲשֻׁמַּע		אֲסוֹבַב
Plur. 3 m.	יְחָמְלוּ		יְבֹרְכוּ	יְשֻׁמְּעוּ		יְסוֹבְבוּ
3 f.	תְּחָמַלְנָה		תְּבֹרַכְנָה	תְּשֻׁמַּעְנָה		תְּסוֹבַבְנָה
2 m.	תְּחָמְלוּ		תְּבֹרְכוּ	תְּשֻׁמְּעוּ		תְּסוֹבְבוּ
2 f.	תְּחָמַלְנָה		תְּבֹרַכְנָה	תְּשֻׁמַּעְנָה		תְּסוֹבַבְנָה
1	נְחָמַל		נְבֹרַךְ	נְשֻׁמַּע		נְסוֹבַב
PRES. apoc.						
PARTICIPLE.	מְחָמָל	מְעֻמָּד	מְבֹרָךְ	מְשֻׁמָּע	מְנֻגָּשׁ	מְסוֹבָב

Paradigm of Verbs in Puhal.

Verb. ה final.	Verb. א final.	Verb. ו med.	Verb. ו or י init.	Verb. א init.
גֻּלָּה	מֻצָּא	בּוֹנַן	יֻשַּׁב	אֻכַּל
גֻּלְּתָה	מֻצְּאָה	like the last.	regular.	regular.
גֻּלִּיתָ	מֻצֵּאתָ			
גֻּלִּית	מֻצֵּאת			
גֻּלִּיתִי	מֻצֵּאתִי			
גֻּלָּה	מֻצָּא			
גֻּלִּיתֶם	מֻצֵּאתֶם			
גֻּלִּיתֶן	מֻצֵּאתֶן			
גֻּלִּינוּ	מֻצֵּאנוּ			
גֻּלְּתָה	מֻצָּא	בּוֹנַן	יֻשַּׁב	אֻכַּל

יְגֻלֶּה	יְמֻצָּא	יְבוֹנַן	יְיֻשַּׁב	יְאֻכַּל
תְּגֻלֶּה	תְּמֻצָּא	like the last.	&c.	&c.
תְּגֻלֶּה	תְּמֻצָּא			
תְּגֻלִּי	תְּמֻצְּאִי			
אֲגֻלֶּה	אֲמֻצָּא			
יְגֻלּוּ	יְמֻצְּאוּ			
תְּגֻלֶּינָה	תְּמֻצֶּאנָה			
תְּגֻלּוּ	תְּמֻצְּאוּ			
תְּגֻלֶּינָה	תְּמֻצֶּאנָה			
נְגֻלֶּה	נְמֻצָּא			

מְגֻלֶּה	מְמֻצָּא	מְקוֹמָם	מְיֻשָּׁב	מְאֻכָּל

Paradigm of Verbs in Hiphhil.

	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb. 3 gutt.	Verb. ל init.	Verb. ד״ל
Preter.						
Sing. 3 m.	הִקְטִיל	הֶעֱמִיד	הֶזְעִיק	הִשְׁמִיעַ	הִגִּישׁ	הֵחֵל
3 f.	הִקְטִילָה	הֶעֱמִידָה		הִשְׁמִיעָה	הִגִּישָׁה	הֵחֵלָּה
2 m.	הִקְטַלְתָּ	הֶעֱמַדְתָּ	regular.	הִשְׁמַעְתָּ	הִגַּשְׁתָּ	הֵחַלְתָּ
2 f.	הִקְטַלְתְּ	הֶעֱמַדְתְּ		הִשְׁמַעַתְּ	הִגַּשְׁתְּ	הֵחַלְתְּ
1	הִקְטַלְתִּי	הֶעֱמַדְתִּי		הִשְׁמַעְתִּי	הִגַּשְׁתִּי	הֵחַלְתִּי
Plur. 3 m.	הִקְטִילוּ	הֶעֱמִידוּ		הִשְׁמִיעוּ	הִגִּישׁוּ	הֵחֵלּוּ
2 m.	הִקְטַלְתֶּם	הֶעֱמַדְתֶּם		הִשְׁמַעְתֶּם	הִגַּשְׁתֶּם	הֵחַלְתֶּם
2 f.	הִקְטַלְתֶּן	הֶעֱמַדְתֶּן		הִשְׁמַעְתֶּן	הִגַּשְׁתֶּן	הֵחַלְתֶּן
1	הִקְטַלְנוּ	הֶעֱמַדְנוּ		הִשְׁמַעְנוּ	הִגַּשְׁנוּ	הֵחַלְנוּ
Infinitive.	הַקְטִיל	הַעֲמִיד	הַזְעִיק	הַשְׁמִיעַ	הַגִּישׁ	הָחֵל
Imperative.						
Sing. m.	הַקְטֵל	הַעֲמֵד	הַזְעֵק	הַשְׁמַע	הַגֵּשׁ	הָחֵל
f.	הַקְטִילִי	הַעֲמִידִי	&c.	הַשְׁמִיעִי	הַגִּישִׁי	הָחֵלִּי
Plur. m.	הַקְטִילוּ	הַעֲמִידוּ		הַשְׁמִיעוּ	הַגִּישׁוּ	הָחֵלּוּ
f.	הַקְטֵלְנָה	הַעֲמֵדְנָה		הַשְׁמַעְנָה	הַגֵּשְׁנָה	הָחֵלְנָה
Present.						
Sing. 3. m.	יַקְטִיל	יַעֲמִיד	יַזְעִיק	יַשְׁמִיעַ	יַגִּישׁ	יָחֵל
3 f.	תַּקְטִיל	תַּעֲמִיד	&c.	תַּשְׁמִיעַ	תַּגִּישׁ	תָּחֵל
2 m.	תַּקְטִיל	תַּעֲמִיד		תַּשְׁמִיעַ	תַּגִּישׁ	תָּחֵל
2 f.	תַּקְטִילִי	תַּעֲמִידִי		תַּשְׁמִיעִי	תַּגִּישִׁי	תָּחֵלִּי
1	אַקְטִיל	אַעֲמִיד		אַשְׁמִיעַ	אַגִּישׁ	אָחֵל
Plur. 3 m.	יַקְטִילוּ	יַעֲמִידוּ		יַשְׁמִיעוּ	יַגִּישׁוּ	יָחֵלּוּ
3 f.	תַּקְטֵלְנָה	תַּעֲמֵדְנָה		תַּשְׁמַעְנָה	תַּגִּשְׁנָה	תָּחֵלְנָה
2 m.	תַּקְטִילוּ	תַּעֲמִידוּ		תַּשְׁמִיעוּ	תַּגִּישׁוּ	תָּחֵלּוּ
2 f.	תַּקְטֵלְנָה	תַּעֲמֵדְנָה		תַּשְׁמַעְנָה	תַּגִּשְׁנָה	תָּחֵלְנָה
1	נַקְטִיל	נַעֲמִיד		נַשְׁמִיעַ	נַגִּישׁ	נָחֵל
Pres. apoc.	יַקְטֵל	יַעֲמֵד	יַזְעֵק	יַשְׁמַע	יַגֵּשׁ	
Participle.	מַקְטִיל	מַעֲמִיד	מַזְעִיק	מַשְׁמִיעַ	מַגִּישׁ	מֵחֵל

Paradigm of Verbs in Hiphhil.

Verb. ע init.	Verb. ו or י init.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ו med.	Verb. א final.	Verb. ה final.
הַגְלָה	הֵימִיב	הֵקִים	הֵבִין	הִמְצִיא	הִגְלָה
הִגְלָהָ	הֵימִיבָה	הֵקִימָה	like the last.	הִמְצִיאָה	הִגְלָהָ
הִגְלִיתָ	הֵימַבְתָּ	הֵקַמְתָּ		הִמְצֵאתָ	הִגְלִיתָ
הִגְלִית	הֵימַבְתְּ	הֵקַמְתְּ		הִמְצֵאת	הִגְלִית
הִגְלֵיתִי	הֵימַבְתִּי	הֵקַמְתִּי		הִמְצֵאתִי	הִגְלֵיתִי
הִגְלָה	הֵימִיבוּ	הֵקִימוּ		הִמְצִיאוּ	הִגְלָה
הִגְלִיתֶם	הֵימַבְתֶּם	הֵקַמְתֶּם		הִמְצֵאתֶם	הִגְלִיתֶם
הִגְלִיתֶן	הֵימַבְתֶּן	הֵקַמְתֶּן		הִמְצֵאתֶן	הִגְלִיתֶן
הִגְלִינוּ	הֵימַבְנוּ	הֵקַמְנוּ		הִמְצֵאנוּ	הִגְלִינוּ
like הֶעֱמִיד					
הַגְלֹת	הֵימִיב	הָקִים	הָבִין	הַמְצִיא	הַגְלֹת
הַגְלָה	הֵימֵב	הָקֵם	הָבֵן	הַמְצֵא	הַגְלָה
הַגְלִי	הֵימִיבִי	הָקִימִי		הַמְצִיאִי	הַגְלִי
הַגְלוּ	הֵימִיבוּ	הָקִימוּ		הַמְצִיאוּ	הַגְלוּ
הַגְלֶינָה	הֵימַבְנָה	הָקֵמְנָה		הַמְצֵאנָה	הַגְלֶינָה
&c.					
יַגְלֶה	יֵימִיב	יָקִים	יָבִין	יַמְצִיא	יַגְלֶה
תַּגְלֶה	תֵּימִיב	תָּקִים	like the last.	תַּמְצִיא	תַּגְלֶה
תַּגְלֶה	תֵּימִיב	תָּקִים		תַּמְצִיא	תַּגְלֶה
תַּגְלִי	תֵּימִיבִי	תָּקִימִי		תַּמְצִיאִי	תַּגְלִי
אַגְלֶה	אֵימִיב	אָקִים		אַמְצִיא	אַגְלֶה
יַגְלוּ	יֵימִיבוּ	יָקִימוּ		יַמְצִיאוּ	יַגְלוּ
תַּגְלֶינָה	תֵּימַבְנָה	תָּקֵמְנָה		תַּמְצֵאנָה	תַּגְלֶינָה
תַּגְלוּ	תֵּימִיבוּ	תָּקִימוּ		תַּמְצִיאוּ	תַּגְלוּ
נַגְלֶה	נֵימִיב	נָקִים		נַמְצִיא	נַגְלֶה
&c.					
יֶגֶל	יֵימֵב	יָקֵם		יַמְצֵא	יֶגֶל
מַגְלֶה	מֵימִיב	מָקִים	מֵבִין	מַמְצִיא	מַגְלֶה

Paradigm of Verbs in Hophhal.

	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb 3 gutt.	Verb. ל init.	Verb. ד״ל
Preter.						
Sing. 3 m.	הָקְטַל	הָעְמַד	הָזְעַק	הָשְׁמַע	הֻגַּשׁ	הוּסַב
3 f.	הָקְטְלָה	הָעְמְדָה	הָזְעֲקָה	הָשְׁמְעָה	הֻגְּשָׁה	הוּסַבָּה
2 m.	הָקְטַלְתָּ	הָעְמַדְתָּ	הָזְעַקְתָּ	הָשְׁמַעְתָּ	הֻגַּשְׁתָּ	הוּסַבּוֹתָ
2 f.	הָקְטַלְתְּ	הָעְמַדְתְּ	הָזְעַקְתְּ	הָשְׁמַעְתְּ	הֻגַּשְׁתְּ	הוּסַבּוֹת
1	הָקְטַלְתִּי	הָעְמַדְתִּי	הָזְעַקְתִּי	הָשְׁמַעְתִּי	הֻגַּשְׁתִּי	הוּסַבּוֹתִי
Plur. 3	הָקְטְלוּ	הָעְמְדוּ	הָזְעֲקוּ	הָשְׁמְעוּ	הֻגְּשׁוּ	הוּסַבּוּ
2 m.	הָקְטַלְתֶּם	הָעְמַדְתֶּם	הָזְעַקְתֶּם	הָשְׁמַעְתֶּם	הֻגַּשְׁתֶּם	הוּסַבּוֹתֶם
2 f.	הָקְטַלְתֶּן	הָעְמַדְתֶּן	הָזְעַקְתֶּן	הָשְׁמַעְתֶּן	הֻגַּשְׁתֶּן	הוּסַבּוֹתֶן
1	הָקְטַלְנוּ	הָעְמַדְנוּ	הָזְעַקְנוּ	הָשְׁמַעְנוּ	הֻגַּשְׁנוּ	הוּסַבּוֹנוּ
Infinitive.	הָקְטֵל	הָעְמֵד	הָזְעֵק	הָשְׁמֵע	הֻגַּשׁ	הוּסַב
Imperative. Sing. m. f. Plur. m. f.	none.					
Present.						
Sing. 3 m.	יָקְטַל	יָעְמַד	יָזְעַק	יָשְׁמַע	יֻגַּשׁ	יוּסַב
3 f.	תָּקְטַל	תָּעְמַד	תָּזְעַק	תָּשְׁמַע	תֻּגַּשׁ	תּוּסַב
2 m.	תָּקְטַל	תָּעְמַד	תָּזְעַק	תָּשְׁמַע	תֻּגַּשׁ	תּוּסַב
2 f.	תָּקְטְלִי	תָּעְמְדִי	תָּזְעֲקִי	תָּשְׁמְעִי	תֻּגְּשִׁי	תּוּסַבִּי
1	אָקְטַל	אָעְמַד	אָזְעַק	אָשְׁמַע	אֻגַּשׁ	אוּסַב
Plur. 3 m.	יָקְטְלוּ	יָעְמְדוּ	יָזְעֲקוּ	יָשְׁמְעוּ	יֻגְּשׁוּ	יוּסַבּוּ
3 f.	תָּקְטַלְנָה	תָּעְמַדְנָה	תָּזְעַקְנָה	תָּשְׁמַעְנָה	תֻּגַּשְׁנָה	תּוּסַבֶּינָה
2 m.	תָּקְטְלוּ	תָּעְמְדוּ	תָּזְעֲקוּ	תָּשְׁמְעוּ	תֻּגְּשׁוּ	תּוּסַבּוּ
2 f.	תָּקְטַלְנָה	תָּעְמַדְנָה	תָּזְעַקְנָה	תָּשְׁמַעְנָה	תֻּגַּשְׁנָה	תּוּסַבֶּינָה
1	נָקְטַל	נָעְמַד	נָזְעַק	נָשְׁמַע	נֻגַּשׁ	נוּסַב
Pres. apoc.						
Participle.	מָקְטָל	מָעְמָד	מָזְעָק	מָשְׁמָע	מֻגָּשׁ	מוּסָב

Paradigm of Verbs in Hophḥal.

Verb. ל final.	Verb. ע final.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ו med.	Verb. ו or י init.	Verb. א init.
הָגְלָה	הָמְצָא	הוּקַם	הוּבַן	הוּטַב	הָאֻכַל
הָגְלְתָה	הֻמְצְאָה	הוּקְמָה		הוּשְׁבָה	
הָגְלִיתָ	הֻמְצֵאתָ	הוּקַמְתָּ	like the last.	הוּשַׁבְתָּ	like the last.
הָגְלִית	הֻמְצֵאת	הוּקַמְתְּ		הוּשַׁבְתְּ	
הָגְלִיתִי	הֻמְצֵאתִי	הוּקַמְתִּי		הוּשַׁבְתִּי	
הָגְלָה	הֻמְצָא	הוּקַם		הוּשְׁבָה	
הָגְלְיָה	הֻמְצְאָה	הוּקְמָה		הוּשְׁבָה	
הָגְלִינוּ	הֻמְצֵאנוּ	הוּקַמְנוּ		הוּשַׁבְנוּ	
הָגְלִיתֶם	הֻמְצֵאתֶם	הוּקַמְתֶּם		הוּשַׁבְתֶּם	
הָגְלִיתֶן	הֻמְצֵאתֶן	הוּקַמְתֶּן		הוּשַׁבְתֶּן	
הָגְלוּ	הֻמְצְאוּ	הוּקְמוּ		הוּשְׁבוּ	

הָגְלָת	הֻמְצָא	הוּקַם	הוּבַן	הוּטַב	הָאֻכַל

יָגְלָה	יֻמְצָא	יוּקַם	יוּבַן	יוּטַב	יָאֻכַל
תָּגְלָה	תֻּמְצָא	תּוּקַם		תּוּשַׁב	
תָּגְלָה	תֻּמְצָא	תּוּקַם	&c.	תּוּשַׁב	&c.
תָּגְלִי	תֻּמְצְאִי	תּוּקְמִי		תּוּשְׁבִי	
אָגְלָה	אֻמְצָא	אוּקַם		אוּשַׁב	
נָגְלָה	נֻמְצָא	נוּקַם		נוּשַׁב	
תָּגְלֶינָה	תֻּמְצֶאנָה	תּוּקַמְנָה		תּוּשַׁבְנָה	
יָגְלוּ	יֻמְצְאוּ	יוּקְמוּ		יוּשְׁבוּ	
תָּגְלֶינָה	תֻּמְצֶאנָה	תּוּקַמְנָה		תּוּשַׁבְנָה	
נָגְלָה	נֻמְצָא	נוּקַם		נוּשַׁב	

מָגְלָה	מֻמְצָא	מוּקַם	מוּבָן	מוּטָב	מָאֻכָל

Paradigm of Verbs in HITHPAḤEL.

	Regular Verb.	Verb. 1 gutt.	Verb. 2 gutt.	Verb. 3 gutt.	Verb. נ init.	Verb. ד"ד
PRETER.						
Sing. 3 m.	הִתְקַטֵּל	הִתְעַמֵּד	הִתְבָּרֵךְ	הִתְגַּלַּח	הִתְנַגֵּשׁ	הִתְגּוֹלֵל
3 f.	הִתְקַטְּלָה		הִתְבָּרְכָה	הִתְגַּלְּחָה		הִתְגּוֹלְלָה
2 m.	הִתְקַטַּלְתָּ	regular.	הִתְבָּרַכְתָּ	הִתְגַּלַּחְתָּ	regular.	הִתְגּוֹלַלְתָּ
2 f.	הִתְקַטַּלְתְּ		הִתְבָּרַכְתְּ	הִתְגַּלַּחְתְּ		הִתְגּוֹלַלְתְּ
1	הִתְקַטַּלְתִּי		הִתְבָּרַכְתִּי	הִתְגַּלַּחְתִּי		הִתְגּוֹלַלְתִּי
Plur. 3 m.	הִתְקַטְּלוּ		הִתְבָּרְכוּ	הִתְגַּלְּחוּ		הִתְגּוֹלְלוּ
2 m.	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּם		הִתְבָּרַכְתֶּם	הִתְגַּלַּחְתֶּם		הִתְגּוֹלַלְתֶּם
2 f.	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּן		הִתְבָּרַכְתֶּן	הִתְגַּלַּחְתֶּן		הִתְגּוֹלַלְתֶּן
1	הִתְקַטַּלְנוּ		הִתְבָּרַכְנוּ	הִתְגַּלַּחְנוּ		הִתְגּוֹלַלְנוּ
INFINITIVE.	הִתְקַטֵּל	הִתְעַמֵּד	הִתְבָּרֵךְ	הִתְגַּלַּח	הִתְנַגֵּשׁ	הִתְגּוֹלֵל
IMPERATIVE.						
Sing. m.	הִתְקַטֵּל	הִתְעַמֵּד	הִתְבָּרֵךְ	הִתְגַּלַּח	הִתְנַגֵּשׁ	הִתְגּוֹלֵל
f.	הִתְקַטְּלִי		הִתְבָּרְכִי	הִתְגַּלְּחִי		הִתְגּוֹלְלִי
Plur. m.	הִתְקַטְּלוּ	&c.	הִתְבָּרְכוּ	הִתְגַּלְּחוּ	&c.	הִתְגּוֹלְלוּ
f.	הִתְקַטֵּלְנָה		הִתְבָּרַכְנָה	הִתְגַּלַּחְנָה		הִתְגּוֹלַלְנָה
PRESENT.						
Sing. 3 m.	יִתְקַטֵּל	יִתְעַמֵּד	יִתְבָּרֵךְ	יִתְגַּלַּח	יִתְנַגֵּשׁ	יִתְגּוֹלֵל
3 f.	תִּתְקַטֵּל		תִּתְבָּרֵךְ	תִּתְגַּלַּח		תִּתְגּוֹלֵל
2 m.	תִּתְקַטֵּל	&c.	תִּתְבָּרֵךְ	תִּתְגַּלַּח	&c.	תִּתְגּוֹלֵל
2 f.	תִּתְקַטְּלִי		תִּתְבָּרְכִי	תִּתְגַּלְּחִי		תִּתְגּוֹלְלִי
1	אֶתְקַטֵּל		אֶתְבָּרֵךְ	אֶתְגַּלַּח	regular.	אֶתְגּוֹלֵל
Plur. 3 m.	יִתְקַטְּלוּ		יִתְבָּרְכוּ	יִתְגַּלְּחוּ		יִתְגּוֹלְלוּ
3 f.	תִּתְקַטֵּלְנָה		תִּתְבָּרַכְנָה	תִּתְגַּלַּחְנָה		תִּתְגּוֹלַלְנָה
2 m.	תִּתְקַטְּלוּ		תִּתְבָּרְכוּ	תִּתְגַּלְּחוּ		תִּתְגּוֹלְלוּ
2 f.	תִּתְקַטֵּלְנָה		תִּתְבָּרַכְנָה	תִּתְגַּלַּחְנָה		תִּתְגּוֹלַלְנָה
1	נִתְקַטֵּל		נִתְבָּרֵךְ	נִתְגַּלַּח		נִתְגּוֹלֵל
PRES. apoc.						
PARTICIPLE.	מִתְקַטֵּל	מִתְעַמֵּד	מִתְבָּרֵךְ	מִתְגַּלַּח	מִתְנַגֵּשׁ	מִתְגּוֹלֵל

Paradigm of Verbs in HITHPAḤEL.

Verb. ה final.	Verb. א final.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ע med.	Verb. ע init.	Verb. ע init.	Verb. א init.
הִתְגַּלָּה	הִתְמַצָּא	הִתְבּוֹנֵן	הִתְקוֹמֵם	הִתְעַשֵּׁב	הִתְעַשֵּׁב	הִתְאַבֵּל
הִתְגַּלֵּתָה	הִתְמַצֵּאתָה		הִתְקוֹמַמְתָּ			
הִתְגַּלֵּית	הִתְמַצֵּאת		הִתְקוֹמַמְתְּ			
הִתְגַּלֵּיתִי	הִתְמַצֵּאתִי		הִתְקוֹמַמְתִּי			
הִתְגַּלָּה	הִתְמַצֵּא		הִתְקוֹמֵם			
הִתְגַּלְּתָה	הִתְמַצְּאָה		הִתְקוֹמְמָה			
הִתְגַּלִּינוּ	הִתְמַצֵּאנוּ		הִתְקוֹמַמְנוּ			
הִתְגַּלֵּיתֶם	הִתְמַצֵּאתֶם		הִתְקוֹמַמְתֶּם			
הִתְגַּלֵּיתֶן	הִתְמַצֵּאתֶן		הִתְקוֹמַמְתֶּן			
הִתְגַּלּוּ	הִתְמַצְּאוּ		הִתְקוֹמְמוּ			
הִתְגַּלְּתָה	הִתְמַצְּאָה		הִתְקוֹמְמָה			
הִתְגַּלִּינָה	הִתְמַצֵּאנָה		הִתְקוֹמַמְנָה			
הִתְגַּלֵּת	הִתְמַצֵּא	הִתְבּוֹנֵן	הִתְקוֹמֵם	הִתְעַשֵּׁב	הִתְעַשֵּׁב	הִתְאַבֵּל
הִתְגַּלָּה	הִתְמַצֵּא	הִתְבּוֹנֵן	הִתְקוֹמֵם	הִתְעַשֵּׁב	הִתְעַשֵּׁב	הִתְאַבֵּל
הִתְגַּלִּי	הִתְמַצְּאִי	&c.	הִתְקוֹמְמִי	&c.	&c.	&c.
הִתְגַּלּוּ	הִתְמַצְּאוּ		הִתְקוֹמְמוּ			
הִתְגַּלְּנָה	הִתְמַצֵּאנָה		הִתְקוֹמַמְנָה			
יִתְגַּלֶּה	יִתְמַצֵּא	יִתְבּוֹנֵן	יִתְקוֹמֵם	יִתְעַשֵּׁב	יִתְעַשֵּׁב	יִתְאַבֵּל
תִּתְגַּלֶּה	תִּתְמַצֵּא		תִּתְקוֹמֵם			
תִּתְגַּלֶּה	תִּתְמַצֵּא		תִּתְקוֹמֵם			
תִּתְגַּלִּי	תִּתְמַצְּאִי		תִּתְקוֹמְמִי			
אֶתְגַּלֶּה	אֶתְמַצֵּא		אֶתְקוֹמֵם			
יִתְגַּלּוּ	יִתְמַצְּאוּ		יִתְקוֹמְמוּ			
תִּתְגַּלֶּינָה	תִּתְמַצֵּאנָה		תִּתְקוֹמַמְנָה			
תִּתְגַּלּוּ	תִּתְמַצְּאוּ		תִּתְקוֹמְמוּ			
תִּתְגַּלֶּינָה	תִּתְמַצֵּאנָה		תִּתְקוֹמַמְנָה			
נִתְגַּלֶּה	נִתְמַצֵּא		נִתְקוֹמֵם			
יִתְגַּל						
מִתְגַּלֶּה	מִתְמַצֵּא	מִתְבּוֹנֵן	מִתְקוֹמֵם	מִתְעַשֵּׁב	מִתְעַשֵּׁב	מִתְאַבֵּל

like the last. regular. regular. regular.

LECTURE XIV.

ON THE SYNTAX.

226. In endeavouring to investigate the principles of the Hebrew Syntax, we shall first consider the nature and construction of propositions; secondly, those of their several parts; and, lastly, shew how these have been combined, according to the Authors of the accents.

2d, In the first place, then, every proposition will be either *general* or *particular*. A general proposition is that which contains a complete sentence, expressive of some general truth, without reference to particulars: as, "Men die." A particular, or singular, proposition (as it is sometimes called), expresses only that which relates to particular individuals: as, "The men die." Hence,

3d, When any general proposition is enounced in Hebrew, the word, or words, used for the purpose of expressing the subject, will, generally, be indefinite: i. e. will not have the definite article, or be otherwise defined;* while that which is intended to be the most impressive, will stand first in order: e. g. זוֹרֵעַ עַוְלָה

---

* In such expressions as תּוֹרַת יְהוָה תְּמִימָה *the law of the Lord is perfect*, &c. Ps. xix. 8, &c. although the truth is general, the proposition is not so; because it relates to one particular, not to any general, law.

The subject and predicate are, according to the Grammarians of Arabia, two words so placed, that they may be independent of each other in a *grammatical* or *formal* point of view, their relation being purely *logical*. The author of the *Hidayat oon Nahve* (p ٣٥) says, المبتدأ والخبر هما اسمان مجرّدان من العوامل اللفظيّة احدهما مسندٌ اليه ويسمّي المبتدأ والثّاني مسندٌ به ويسمّي الخبر نحو زيد قائم والعامل فيها معنوي

יְקַצֹּר־אָוֶן (any one)* SOWING *iniquity, reaps vanity,* Prov. xxii. 8; מַיִם עֲמֻקִּים עֵצָה בְלֵב־אִישׁ (as) DEEP WATERS (so is) *counsel in the heart of man,* Ib. xx. 5.

4th, And, on the contrary, when any particular proposition is to be enounced, the word or words expressive of its subject must be made definite: as, הַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוּם (as to) THE SERPENT, *he was subtle,* Gen. iii. 1; פִּקּוּדֵי יְהוָה יְשָׁרִים THE PRECEPTS OF JEHOVAH (are) *right,* Ps. xix. 9. This holds good whether the proposition be affirmative or negative.

5th, Hence Isa. i. 13, "It is iniquity, even the solemn meeting," is incorrect; for then we must have had אָוֶן וְהַעֲצָרָה in order to point out the subject as definite. We must consider עֲצָרָה, therefore, as being in apposition with the predicate; and the sense will be: "it is iniquity and a restraint," or the like.

6th, Propositions may also be *Incomplex, Complex; Simple,* or *Compound.*

7th, *Incomplex* propositions are those which contain

وهو الابتداء "*The subject and predicate are two words construed independently of any* GRAMMATICAL *government. The first is that of which something is predicated, and is called* المبتدا *or, the beginning: the second is that by which this predication is made, and is termed* الخبر *the enouncer: as,* ZAID (is) STANDING. *The government of them is regulated by the sense* (or, *is logical*), *that is, by the beginning," or subject matter of the discourse.*

This conjunction of words is termed by them الكلام, and is thus described by Ibn ul Hájib: ما تضمّن كلمتين بالاسناد ولا يتأتّي ذلك الا في اسمين او في فعل واسم. "It is that which comprehends two words in connection with each other, which cannot happen except in the concurrence of two nouns, or, of a verb and noun." The word constituting the subject (المبتداء) is, according to *El Hazeri,* placed first, on account of the importance which it holds in the estimation of the speaker or writer." See Commentary on the Agrumia, by Schnabell, Amsterdam, 1755, p. ٣٠-٣١.

* The capitals are intended to point out the words upon which the rule immediately bears.

no qualifying, or otherwise modifying, words in connection with either the subject or predicate. *Complex* propositions are those which have such words. Of the first, וְבָנָה בָיִת *a house is built,* Prov. xxiv. 3, is an example. Of the second, בְּחָכְמָה וְבָנָה בָיִת *in,* or *by, wisdom is a house built,* Ib.

8th, *Simple* propositions are those which contain no supplementary or subordinate parts. *Compound* propositions are those which have such parts. Example of the first, בְּחָכְמָה וְבָנָה בָיִת *in wisdom is a house built.* Of the second, וְנָחָה עָלָיו רוּחַ יְהוָה רוּחַ חָכְמָה וּבִינָה *the* SPIRIT *of Jehovah, the* SPIRIT *of wisdom and discretion, shall rest upon him,* Is. xi. 2.

9th, Of *Complex* and *Compound* propositions examples will be given hereafter. We shall now proceed to consider the relation of the subject with the predicate; which is indeed necessary to point out the construction of simple and incomplex propositions.

Of the Predicate of Propositions.

227. The predicate of any proposition may consist of nouns attributive or substantive (if predicables), or of verbs or pronouns, as in other languages.

2d, Every proposition, whether general or particular, will, unless something particular require the contrary, have its predicate indefinite. (Verbs, of course, when in the predicate, do not come under this rule, because it cannot be said of them, that they are either definite or indefinite): e. g. שׁוּחָה עֲמֻקָּה זוֹנָה *a whore* (is) *a deep ditch,* Prov. xxiii. 27.

3d, Here, זוֹנָה being indefinite, the proposition will be general: and, as the rule requires the predicate also to be indefinite, this becomes a case in which some ambiguity might arise, as to which of the substantives is the subject of the proposition. And such ambiguities are occasionally met with.

4th, Examples of particular propositions: וְהַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוּם *and* (as to) THE SERPENT (he) *was subtle*, Gen. iii. 1; יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ* *Jehovah* (is) *king*, Ps. x. 16. With a verb: בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים HE CREATED (i. e.) GOD, Gen. i. 1.

5th, When, however, any thing specific is intended to be enounced by the predicate, it will be made definite: as, יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים *Jehovah he is* THE GOD, *Jehovah he is* THE GOD, 1 Kings xviii. 39.

6th, Here, as both the subject and predicate are made definite, unless a pronoun (as הוּא in this instance) be introduced in the place of the logical copula; or, unless the construction shall otherwise tend to explain the intention of the writer, an ambiguity will arise, as to which of the words so defined is to be considered as the subject: e. g. אֲנִי־הוּא הַמְדַבֵּר *I* (am) *he who speaketh*, Isa. lii. 6. Or, taking הוּא as the logical copula, *I am the speaker*. But, by inverting the proposition, (as to) *the speaker, it is I*. In all these cases, however, the sense afforded is the same. In others, where it is not, we have no other resource than the order of the construction, or the general sense of the context to guide us.

7th, From this and the case above noticed (Art. 227. 3.) some difficulties will occasionally arise in construing the Hebrew text, particularly in the books of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, and the Prophets, where the style is often sententious and the order inverted.

With respect to the last example, it may be remarked, that as the Hebrews have no abstract verb, which can stand for our logical copula *is;* and, as any pronoun may stand in the predicate of a sentence, due regard must be had to the subject of the context, in order to ascertain which of the pronouns, when more than one is used, is in the predicate: e. g. In Isa. xli. 4, we have אֲנִי־הוּא *I he*, where a

---

* Exod. xxxiv. 6, &c. יְהוָה יְהוָה אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן *Jehovah Jehovah* (is) *a God merciful and gracious*, &c. Both the construction and accents require that this passage be thus taken. Our translators, however, have taken it differently.

very slight consideration of the context will shew us, that אֲנִי is to be considered as being in apposition with the subject of the sentence יְהוָה, and that הוּא must be in the predicate. See also Deut. xxxii. 39, Neh. ix. 7, Jer. xiv. 22, Isa. xli. 4, xliii. 25, &c.

Of the Concordance of the Subject with the Predicate.

228. Whatever is predicated of any thing, must not be incongruous with it, in sense at least; what the grammatical agreement may be, we shall see presently.

2d, As the Grammatical forms of words were perhaps not much attended to in very early times, a difference in termination, for the purpose of distinguishing between the feminine and the masculine gender would, probably, be among the first wanted, particularly in cases wherein there was no other means of intimating of what sex the person spoken of may be. Number would soon be in the same predicament; and hence, such terminations generally agreed upon, and allowed to intimate these particulars; or, other words used at first as attributes, and afterwards abridged and adopted as terminations, would be made to supply these defects. The latter of which I am inclined to believe is the fact.

3d, If, then, it could ever be necessary to make any such distinctions as these, it must have been so in the subjects and predicates of sentences: because, as the one must be known to refer to the other; and, as this could not be pointed out, in many cases, without some mark to apprize us of such relation, these terminations must necessarily have been employed in such cases.

4th, In process of time, however, recourse would be had to the several figures of Rhetoric, such as *Personification, Epanorthosis, Metonymy,* or the like, each of which would exert a very considerable influence on the

construction of sentences. This is often found to be the case. When, therefore, we are to consider the relation of a subject with its predicate in the Hebrew, it will sometimes be found necessary to have recourse to one or other of these figures.

5th, Generally then, the Predicate is found to agree with its subject in gender and number, considered either in a *logical* or *a formal* point of view.

By *logical* we mean, when the *gender*, *number*, &c. is regulated, not according to the *grammatical forms* of words, but by their *significations;* in which case they may be influenced by any of the figures of rhetoric, or not. By *formal* we mean, when the *gender*, *number*, &c. are considered, with reference to the *grammatical forms* only: e. g. כִּי־כָשְׁלָה יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם וְיהוּדָה נָפָל *Jerusalem* HATH STUMBLED, *and Judah* HATH *fallen*, Isa. iii. 8. Here יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם is considered as being feminine, not as to form, but signification (Art. 142. 4.); its predicate, therefore, כָּשְׁלָה, may be said to be in *logical*, not in *formal*, concordance with it. In the next member, יְהוּדָה, though feminine in form, is not considered as being so in signification; its predicate, therefore, is put in the masculine gender, נָפָל.*

6th, In the example וְהָיְתָה מְסִלָּה *And* (there) *shall be a high way*, Is. xi. 16, the concordance is purely *formal*. The same may be said of .... אֱלֹהִים קְדֹשִׁים *God* (is) *holy ones*, Jos. xxiv. 19; תְּתָעוּ אֹתִי אֱלֹהִים *They caused me to wander*, (i. e.) *God*, Gen. xx. 13. See also Gen. xxxv. 7, 2 Sam. vii. 23, Jer. x. 10. In all which cases the agreement seems to have been made with reference to the forms only, and not to the significations, of words.†

---

* Hence the names of nations, tribes, or families, may be taken either as collective, or as singular, nouns; and the names of regions, cities, &c. as singular feminine nouns, considered as containers, &c. See Exod. xiv. 30, Jer. xlviii. 11, 1 Kings xx. 20, 2 Sam. xvi. 3, Ps. cxiv. 2, Job i. 15. When, however, a verb is used as the predicate, as will be presently seen, the *apparent* nominative is not the *real* nominative or subject: but, as this must be in apposition with the *real subject*, the rule respecting the concordance holds good.

† I am well aware that these and similar passages have been appealed to in support of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but, until it shall be made to

7th, The following is an instance of Personification: חֶסֶד־וֶאֱמֶת נִפְגָּשׁוּ צֶדֶק וְשָׁלוֹם נָשָׁקוּ *grace and truth have* MET *each other, righteousness and peace have* SALUTED *each other,* Ps. lxxxiv. 11; i. e. they have met and saluted as men generally do, when on good terms with one another.

8th, The following ones, of Metonymy:* הֶבֶל בְּנֵי־אָדָם כָּזָב בְּנֵי־אִישׁ *the sons of mean men* (are) *vanity, the sons of eminent men* (are) *a lie,* i. e. they are in effect as deceptive as vanity, or a lie; קִירֹתָיו עֵץ *its walls* (are) *wood,* i. e. *made of wood,* Ezek. xli. 22; יִהְיוּ כְּלֵי הַנְּעָרִים קֹדֶשׁ *the vessels of the young made* (are) *holiness,* i. e. made holy, 1 Sam. xxi. 6; הַמְּלָאכָה הָרַבָּה † *The work* (is) *an increasing,* Neh. iv. 13, i. e. is in a state of progress. So we say in English, "Knowledge is power," i. e. it is the cause of power; "Money is a defence," is the means of obtaining a defence.

9th, When one Predicate answers to several subjects, differing from each other either in gender, number, or both, it may be put in the plural number, as referring to them all; or, it may be made to agree, both in gender and number, with the *nearest,* or, with that which might be considered as the most worthy:‡ e. g. וְאַבְרָהָם וְשָׂרָה זְקֵנִים *and Abraham and Sarah* (WERE) OLD, Gen. xviii. 11; וַיָּקָם אֲבִימֶלֶךְ וּפִיכֹל שַׂר־צְבָאוֹ וַיָּשֻׁבוּ *So he*

---

appear probable, that the Sacred Writers did usually involve doctrines of this kind in the *mere forms* of words, I must be allowed to object to such methods of supporting an article of faith, which stands in need of no such support.

* See Glass. Philolog. Sacr. p. 838—97. Storr. Observ. p. 13, &c.

† Storr. pp. 11. 17, &c. The use of abstracts for concretes, Storr refers to a Synecdoche, see p. 20; and vice versa, p. 21.

‡ The plural is considered as more worthy than the singular, and the masculine than the feminine gender. But, in the last case, the mother will be considered as more worthy than the children.

arose, (i. e.) *Abimelek and Phicol the captain of his host,* AND THEY RETURNED, Gen. xxi. 32.

10th, When, however, the predicate precedes, it generally agrees with the nearest noun; but, when it follows, it will mostly take the plural form, as in the last example. See also Gen. viii. 16. 18, xxxi. 14, xxxiii. 7, Exod. xvii. 10, xxi. 4, xxix. 15, Num. xii. 1, xxvii. 21, Deut. xxviii. 32, Judg. xiii. 20, Ruth i. 3, Est. ix. 31, 1 Chron. xxv. 1, Job xix. 15, Prov. xxvii. 9, Is. xvi. 10, li. 3, Jer. vii. 20, Ezek. i. 11, xxxv. 10.

11th, When the subject is a *Collective* noun, the Predicate may be in the plural number, agreeing with its subject *logically:* e. g. כָּל־עַמָּהּ נֶאֱנָחִים *the whole of her people* (ARE) SIGHING, Lam. i. 11; עֲשֶׂרֶת צִמְדֵי־כֶרֶם יַעֲשׂוּ בַּת אֶחָת *ten acres of vineyard* (THEY) YIELD *one bath,* Is. v. 10.

12th, When the subject of any Proposition is found in the *definite* state of construction with any word (see Art. 151.), the predicate is mostly made to agree in gender and number with the last of them, provided the signification of the predicate can apply to both (by the figure *Zeugma*): e. g. קוֹל דְּמֵי אָחִיךָ צֹעֲקִים אֵלַי *the voice of thy brother's bloods* (THEY ARE) CRYING *to me,** Gen. iv. 10; קֶשֶׁת גִּבֹּרִים חַתִּים *the bow of the mighty* (ones, THEY ARE) BROKEN, 1 Sam. ii. 4.

See also Lev. xiii. 9, 1 Kings i. 41, xvii. 16, Job xv. 20, xxxii. 7, xxxviii. 21, Jer. iv. 29, x. 22, &c.

---

* M. de Sacy says on the Arabic construction which is parallel to this: "On peut regarder la concordance, en ce cas, comme une concordance logique, parce qu'on y a plus égard au rapport logique qui unit les idées, qu'au rapport grammatical qui se trouve entre les mots." Vol. ii. Art. 332. e. g. إِنَّ رَحْمَةَ اللهِ قَرِيبٌ مِنَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ *Surely the mercy of God* (is) NEAR *to those who do good.* And Storr, (Nomen) *rectum* numerari debet *principale.* Observ. p. 362.

13th, In some cases, however, it is made to agree with the subject: as, כָּל מְלָאכָה לֹא יֵעָשֶׂה *the whole of the work* (it) SHALL *not* BE DONE, Exod. xii. 16.

See also Gen. v. 23. 31, Is. lxiv. 10, Nah. iii. 7, &c. And particularly when the predicate stands first in the order: as, סָרָה קִנְאַת אֶפְרָיִם *the envy of Ephraim* (it) SHALL DEPART, Isa. xi. 13.

Of the Concordance of the Nominative with its Verb.

229. The Concordance of a *real* nominative with its verb, is that of a subject with its predicate. By a *real* nominative, we mean, the pronoun which is always inherent in the verb when in the state of conjugation (See Art. 202.). What, therefore, is usually taken for the nominative is, in fact, either a noun or a pronoun put in apposition with this nominative; and consequently, as before, agreeing either *logically* or *formally* with it, or with the predicate. Considered, therefore, in this point of view, all the cases of apparent discrepancy which can happen under this head, may be resolved into one or other of the preceding ones: e. g. בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים *he created* (i. e.) GOD, Gen. i. 1.

Here the word אֱלֹהִים is manifestly a plural form: but, as the Being here designated by this word is every where affirmed to be *one*, the agreement between the pronoun inherent in the verb בָּרָא and this word is *logical*, not *formal*. The same may be said of יֹאמֶר אֱלֹהִים *he says* (i. e.) *God;* and of many other similar constructions.

2d, Examples of apparent discrepancies in gender and number: 1st, חָזַק ··· הַמִּלְחָמָה *it became strong* (i. e.) *the war*, 2 Kings iii. 26; 2d, הֵבִיא שִׁפְחָתְךָ *he hath brought* (i. e.) *thy handmaid*, 1 Sam. xxv. 27; 3d, יִהְיֶה נַעֲרָה בְתוּלָה *he may be* (i. e.) *the young woman, a virgin*, Deut. xxii. 23; 4th, מַה־יִּהְיוּ חֲלֹמֹתָיו *what they will be* (i. e.) *his dreams*, Gen. xxvii. 20; 5th, רָאוּהָ בָנוֹת *they saw her* (i. e.) *daughters*, Cant. vi. 9.

3d, With the apparent nominative preceding: 6th, דַּעַת ... יִנְעַם *knowledge ... it,* or *he, is pleasant,* Prov. ii. 10; 7th, עָרֶיהָ עָלָה (as to) *her cities, it,* or *he, has ascended,* Jer. xlviii. 15; 8th, זְרֹעוֹת יְתֹמִים יְדֻכָּא (as to) *the arms of the orphans, it is broken,* Job xxii. 9.

4th, The first five of these examples seem to involve an *Epanorthosis,* a figure constantly used in the Arabic, by which something enouuced in a general manner, is afterwards restricted by the addition of other words. Of this the Arabs count four sorts, 1, بدل الكل من الكل, i. e. *the change of the whole for the whole,* or, when any thing is enounced by one or more words, another enunciation is added to the same effect, but in a different point of view: as, جآءني عمر اخوك *Omar came to me* (I mean) *thy brother;* 2, بدل البعض من الكل *the change of a part for the whole:* as, جآءني القوم بعضهم *the people came to me* (I mean) *some of them;* 3, بدل الاشتمال *the change of the contained for the container,* or, *vice versa:* as, سُلِبَ زيد ثوبه *Zaid was stripped* (I mean) *his garment;* 4, بدل الغلط *the change of error:* as, مررت بكلب فرس *I passed by a dog* (I mean) *a horse.* See M. de Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. ii. pp. 225. 394. The شرح الكافية by Moolla Jámi, pp. ٢٤٠-٢٤٥. Glass. edit. Dathe, on the Epanorthosis, pp. 1350—2.

In the first example, then, it is generally announced, that some person or thing has acquired power; it is then added, that this is *the war.* The same may be said of the four following ones. In the sixth example, either a personification is resorted to; or, some such word as דָּבָר *affair, matter, thing,* or the like, is to be supplied by the ellipsis: as, *knowledge* (it is a person, or thing), *that gives pleasure.* In the seventh and eighth, the plurals seem to be taken collectively: as, *her cities* (the whole), *has gone up. The arms of the orphans* (the whole), *is broken.*

5th, When the verb הָיָה is introduced, it is sometimes found to agree with the subject, at others with the predicate: e. g. נְקֻדִּים יִהְיֶה שְׂכָרֶךָ *thy reward* SHALL BE *the spotted ones,* Gen. xxxi. 8; שְׁמָמָה תִּהְיֶה הַר־שֵׂעִיר IT SHALL BE *a devastation* (i. e.) *Mount Seir,* Ezek. xxxv. 15.

6th, So also when a personal pronoun occupies the place of this verb: e. g. חֻקּוֹת הָעַמִּים הֶבֶל הוּא (as to) *the statutes of the people,* IT IS VANITY, Jer. x. 3. i. e. taken collectively.

7th, When, however, inanimate or irrational beings are represented as agents, the feminine form of the verb, is, for the most part, preferred:* e. g. תִּשְׂטֹף סְפִיחֶיהָ עֲפַר־אָרֶץ *it bears away* (i. e.) *her effusions, the dust of the earth,* Job xiv. 19; שִׂפְתֵי חֲכָמִים תִּשְׁמוֹרֵם *the lips of the wise, it preserves them,* Prov. xiv. 3. See also 1 Sam. iv. 15, 2 Sam. x. 9, Job xii. 7, xx. 11, Ps. cxix. 98, Is. lix. 12, Jer. xlviii. 41, li. 56, Mic. iv. 11.

8th, When the *apparent* nominative is in the definite state of construction (see Art. 151.) with another noun, the verb will occasionally agree with the latter: e. g. פִּילֶגֶשׁ כָּלֵב מַעֲכָה יָלַד שֶׁבֶר *the concubine of Caleb* (i. e.) *Maachah* (he) *begat Sheber,* 1 Chron. ii. 48. Which is the same case with that detailed (Art. 228. 12.), subject to the figure *Zeugma.*

9th, When *courage, virility, fortitude, efficiency,* or the like, is intended to be predicated of females, verbs expressive of any acts, &c. done by them, seem to be put in the masculine gender for that purpose; e. g.

---

* This is a constant law in the Arabic, and generally in all the dialects of this family of languages, viz. that it is only when the agent is a rational being that the concordance is *formal.*

כַּאֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם עִם־הַמֵּתִים וְעִמָּדִי *as ye* (women) HAVE DONE (courageously) *with the dead and with me,* Ruth i. 8; וידַעְתֶּם כִּי אֲנִי אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה *and ye* (women) SHALL KNOW (effectively) *that I am the Lord Jehovah,* Ezek. xxiii. 49; וַתַּעֲשִׂי הָרָעוֹת וַתּוּכָל׃ *and thou* (fem.) *doest evil things, and thou* PREVAILEST (manfully), Jer. iii. 5.

See also 1 Sam. ii. 20, 1 Kings xi. 3, 2 Kings viii. 6, Is. lvii. 3, Ezek. xxii. 4, Hos. xiv. 1, Job xxi. 10, Cant. ii. 7, iii. 5, v. 8, viii. 4, Est. i. 20, Ezr. x. 44, &c.*

10th, It has been laid down as a general rule, that the word intended to be considered as the most important in a sentence will stand first (Art. 226. 3.). When, therefore, this happens to be the apparent nominative to a verb, it has generally been termed *the Nominative absolute*.

11th, The office of a nominative absolute is to enounce the subject matter of discourse (p. 282. note); which, as it is done in a manner independent of any of the following context in a *formal* point of view, has been termed *absolute*. Nevertheless, any nouns, pronouns, &c. following, and referring to this nominative, must agree with it either *logically*, or *formally*: e. g. נֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תֶחֱטָא ... וְעָשָׂה &c. (as to) *a soul, when it shall sin* ... AND HE DO, &c., Lev. iv. 2; i. e. as spoken of a person, וַעֲשָׂרָה אֲנָשִׁים נִמְצְאוּ־בָם *and* (as to) TEN MEN, *they were found among them,* Jer. xli. 8; וּמְפִיבֹשֶׁת בֶּן־אֲדֹנֶיךָ יֹאכַל תָּמִיד *but* (as to) *Mephibosheth, the son of thy master,* HE SHALL EAT *continually,* 2 Sam. ix. 10; וּפִילַגְשׁוֹ וּשְׁמָהּ רְאוּמָה וַתֵּלֶד

---

* It is a curious fact, that the Grammarians of Arabia consider females as being *unintelligent* agents, not absolutely, but relatively; and hence they account for these agents having in grammar the same government with collective inanimate nouns. See the Shurho Moolla Jámi, p. ٣١١.

and (as to) *his concubine, whose name was Reumah,* SHE ALSO BROUGHT FORTH, Gen. xxii. 24.

12th, There is also a great number of instances, in which the Subject of the discourse is thus absolutely enounced (Art. 226.), by one or more words, which are not apparent nominatives to verbs, but which are nevertheless termed NOMINATIVES ABSOLUTE: e. g. הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתָּ (as to) THE WORDS *which thou hast heard,* &c., 2 Kings xxii. 18; הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתָּ .... אֵינֶנּוּ שֹׁמְעִים (as to) THE WORD *which thou hast spoken .... we regard not,* Jer. xliv. 16; וּדְמוּת הַחַיּוֹת מַרְאֵיהֶם *and* (as to) THE SIMILITUDE *of the living creatures,* THEIR *appearances,* &c., Ezek. i. 13; וְכֹל דְּבַר חָכְמַת בִּינָה .... וַיִּמְצָאֵם *and* (as to) EVERY MATTER *of wisdom* (and) *discrimination .... so he found them,* Dan. i. 20; אֲנִי הִנֵּה בְרִיתִי אִתָּךְ (as for) ME, *behold my covenant is with thee,* Gen. xvii. 4, &c.

13th, The relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר seems often to be subject to this kind of construction, though always in a subordinate point of view, and when the subject matter of such proposition is not the real subject of the discourse, but is to be referred to it: e. g. אֲשֶׁר תִּדְּפֶנּוּ רוּחַ (as to) WHICH, *the wind disperses it,* Ps. i. 4; אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ לְבִלְתִּי אֲכָל־מִמֶּנּוּ (as to) WHICH, *I commanded thee for not eating of it,* &c., Gen. iii. 11; אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵלָיו (with respect to) WHOM, *the word of the Lord came to him,* &c., Jer. i. 2.

14th, This view of such constructions will account for the apparent pleonasm of the pronoun in Hebrew; and which, in some instances, has found its way into our own version. See also Exod. vi. 4, Lev. xviii. 5, Num. xiii. 27, Deut. xxviii. 49, 2 Kings xiii. 14, Jer. xiv. 1, Ezek. xx. 11, xxxvii. 25, Joel iv. 2, Ps. xcv. 5, and with שֶׁ Eccles. ii. 21.

15th, From the unconnected situation of words thus

constructed, it will be necessary, in rendering them in our language, and some others, to prefix some such expression as, *with reference to, with respect to, as to,* or the like, otherwise our construing will appear bald and unintelligible. This will account for most of the additional words found within brackets in this work.—There are instances, however, in the Hebrew, in which these supplementary words are given:* e. g. לִקְדוֹשִׁים אֲשֶׁר־בָּאָרֶץ AS TO *the saints who are in the land,* Ps. xvi. 3; לַמֻּס מֵרֵעֵהוּ חָסֶד AS TO *the afflicted man, from his friend* (there should be) *kindness,* Job vi. 14; אֶת־מְקוֹם כִּסְאִי WITH RESPECT TO *the place of my throne,* &c., Ezek. xliii. 7; וְאֶת־דּוֹרוֹ *and,* AS TO *his generation,* &c., Is. liii. 8.

16th, Any word, like אֲשֶׁר (No. 13,) may be employed as a subordinate nominative absolute, according to the pleasure of the writer; but, when this is done, its connection with some former word, &c., which may involve the real subject matter of the discourse, will be pointed out by the intervention of some other word: e. g. כִּי הַמַּגִּיד לִי לֵאמֹר FOR, (*as to*) *him who announced to me, saying,* &c., 2 Sam. iv. 10; גַּם־אֲנִי יִקְרֵנִי EVEN, (*as to*) *me, it will happen to me,* Eccl. ii. 15.

17th, In some instances, also, we find both the leading and subordinate subject of a discourse placed together, without any such mark of distinction: e. g. וַאֲנַחְנוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְלֹא עֲזַבְנָהוּ *and,* (AS TO) OURSELVES, (WITH REGARD TO) JEHOVAH *our God, we will certainly not forsake him,* 2 Chron. xiii. 10.

---

* So in the Arabic, Gram. Arabe, vol. ii. Art. 158. Also with أمّا, ف, ل &c., passim.

18th, The recurrence of ו, in all such constructions as this, is said to have the effect of pointing out the comparison or correspondence intended to be instituted between the preceding and following member, i. e. the relation between the prodosis and apodosis: e. g. וְאִם יִמְעַט הַבַּיִת .... וְלָקַח AND *if the house be small* .... THEN *let him take*, &c., Exod. xii. 4.

But of this more will be said when we come to treat of the conjunctions.

LECTURE XV.

ON THE GENERAL DEPENDENCE OF WORDS ONE UPON ANOTHER.

230. Having considered the structure of incomplex propositions, and endeavoured to reduce to some analogy those apparent anomalies which so much perplex the Learner, we now come to consider that dependence of words one upon another which will take place when propositions become complex, and to investigate the principles by which this is regulated.

2d, It will readily be admitted, that when words are to be added, either for the purpose of defining or modifying the signification of others, or, for completing the ideas conveyed by them, the relation which such words bear to one another must be regulated by some easy and intelligible principles. We shall now proceed to point them out.

3d, The principles found to prevail in the Hebrew language may be reduced to two: viz. *apposition*, and what has been termed *the definite state of construction*, (Art. 151.)

4th, By *Apposition* is meant, the juxta-position of two or more words which are, 1st. either different names for the same idea, or, 2d, being such as are not incongruous with it, are added for the purpose of presenting it in some other point of view, or otherwise to modify and define it: e. g. 1st. יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים *Jehovah Elohim*, presents two words in apposition; by the first of these the reader is put in mind of that Being alone, who had revealed himself to the Jews; by the second, the name of any Deity, either true or false. But, when these

two are combined, the sense of the latter is so restricted, as to be applicable to none but the God of Israel. Again, in the example, הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד *the king David.* By the first we shall understand *the king;* but by this we shall not know what king is meant. It may be *the king* of Assyria, Samaria, Egypt, or of any other country; but, when the word *David* is added, the phrase becomes perfectly definite. The first of these may be termed *apposition* of *identity;* the second, of *specification.*

5th, Apposition may also be said to be either *immediate* or *mediate: Immediate,* when the words so connected have no intervening word or words: as, יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים; *mediate,* when some such word, &c. intervenes: as, יִשַׁי בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי *Jesse the Bethlehemite.*

6th, Under this head we shall consider the construction of attributives with substantives, or when used as adverbs. Nouns used as *specificatives,* i. e. when in apposition with others signifying number, weight, measure, &c. Pronouns demonstrative, interrogative, or personal, when added for the purpose of defining, specifying, or otherwise restricting, the significations of other words.

7th, The other principle just mentioned, by which two or more words are so connected as to present one definite idea, is that which regulates the juxta-position of two or more substantives, or attributives *used as substantives,** which are not names for the same thing;

---

* It is usual with writers on the Arabic Grammar to say, when speaking of (what we term) adjectives, or attributives, that they are put to stand for the *essence* or *being* of the person or thing described, including also the properties expressed by such words. So the *Moolla Jámi,* on the Gram. of Ibn ul Hájib, p. ٣١, الوصف وهو كون الاسم دالاً علي ذات مبهمة ماخوذة مع بعض صفاتها سواء كانت هذه الدلالة بحسب الوضع مثل احمر فانه

but which, having a certain relation to one another, will, by their being combined, afford the idea of *proprietorship, materiality, peculiarity,* or the like, which exists between them. This we term the *definite* state of *construction,* generally: but, when the first of two or more such words in construction is an *attributive,* used as a substantive, we shall, for the mere sake of distinction, term this, the *distinctive state* of construction.

8th, This may be considered as being either *immediate* or *mediate,* as before, and for the same reasons.

9th, The complements of all verbs, (i. e. their objective cases, as considered in Latin and other Grammars), whether transitive, intransitive, or neuter; as well as the construction of prepositions, adverbs, or interjections, we shall consider as being regulated by one or other of these principles.

Remarks.

231. All indefinite attributes found in the predicates of propositions, may be considered as being in the state of *immediate apposition* with the noun, either expressed, or implied, which is the real predicate: e. g. רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן יְהוָה *merciful and gracious* (is) *Jehovah,* Ps. ciii. 8, &c.; which, Exod. xxxiv. 6, &c. is given, יְהוָה אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן *Jehovah* (is) A GOD *merciful and gracious.* So the passage כָּשְׁלָה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם *Jerusalem hath stumbled,* might be thus fully expressed, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם עִיר כָּשְׁלָה *Jerusalem* (is) A CITY (that) *hath stumbled;* and hence perhaps, כָּשְׁלָה is put in the feminine form. So Gen. vi. 9, נֹחַ אִישׁ צַדִּיק *Noah* (was) *a just* MAN.

موضع لذات ما اخذت مع بعض صفاتها التي هي الحمرة.

See also the same sentiment repeated under the فاعل, مفعول, and صفة مشبهة. and Mr. de Sacy's Gram. Arabe, vol. i. p. 228. The same is found to prevail in the Persian, Sanscrit, and Bengáli. On the last, see Mr. Haughton's Gram. p. 35. Art. 120.

2d, It is obvious from the first of these examples, that both רַחוּם and חַנּוּן are to be considered in apposition with אֵל which is there *implied*, but which is *expressed* in the second. In the last example also the real predicate is expressed (אִישׁ), with which the following word צַדִּיק is in immediate apposition. In like manner, in the Arabic, اَللّٰهُ كَرِيمٌ is put for اَللّٰهُ اِلٰهٌ كَرِيمٌ *God* (is) *a bountiful* God. Hence the expressions we so often meet with in the Koran, اَللّٰهُ *God*, or اِلٰهُ اٰبَائِكَ *the God of thy fathers*, or, اِلٰهُكَ *thy God*, or اِلٰهُ اِبْرَاهِيمَ *the God of Abraham*, &c. اِلٰهٌ وَاحِدٌ, or اِلٰهًا وَاحِدًا (is) *one* God, according as the grammatical character of the passage may require. Hence, also, the absence of the article universally after the negative particles לֹא, אַל, לֹא, מַא, &c. *no*, *not*, &c. because the word thus negatived must necessarily be a predicate, and not a subject as in the European languages.* Hence اَللّٰهُ لَا اِلٰهَ اِلَّا هُوَ (as to) *God*, *there is no* God *besides him*, &c. In all such cases as the above, then, we have a *Nominative absolute* (Art. 229. 10.), or a *Subject*, attended by its predicate, e. g. *as to Jehovah*, (*he* is) *a merciful and gracious God:* and so of the rest. Where the subsequent words may also be considered as *specific* (Art. 230. 4.)

3d, In all cases, in which both the subject and predicate are made definite, we have nothing more or less than nouns in *immediate* apposition; where the following ones may be considered as being specific as before: and hence the rules relating to the concordance of the subject with the predicate holds good here.

4th, The construction of *apparent* nominatives with their verbs,

---

* We say in English, *No one came;* not so in the Hebrew, &c. Here we must say, *Any one came not*, which is much more proper. So ابن مالك Ibn Málik, in the *Alfia*, عَمَلَ اَن اَجعَلَ لِلا فِي نَكِرَة. مُفرَدَة جَاءَ تلكَ اَو مُكَرَّرَة. Its government is such, that لَا must accompany an indefinite word, whether it be single or repeated.

has been shewn to be nothing more than nouns, &c. in *immediate* apposition with the real nominatives, and which must always agree with them either in a *logical* or *formal* point of view.

Of Words in immediate apposition with one another.

232. When two or more substantives, or attributives used as substantives, are found in Apposition, one or more of them may frequently be considered as occupying the place of adjectives in other languages.* Examples of

---

* Nouns, as already observed, put in apposition, may further be considered in two points of view: the one may be termed *Identity;* as in the phrase יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים *Jehovah Elohim*: the other, *Specification*, as in the instances above. This last is termed by the Arabian Grammarians تمييز *specification*, and is thus explained in the *Hidáyat oon Nahve*, p. ٣٩٠. التمييز هو نكرةٌ تذكر بعد عددٍ او كيلٍ او وزنٍ او مساحةٍ او غير ذلك مما فيه الابهام وترفع ذلك الابهام نحو عندي عشرون رجلاً وقفيزان بُرّاً ومَنَوان سَمْنًا وجريبان قُطنًا وعلي التمرة مثلها زُبداً وقد يكون من غير مقدار نحو خاتَم حديداً وسِوارٌ ذَهَبًا — وقد يقع بعد الجملة لرفع الابهام عن نِسْبَتِها نحو طاب زَيْدٌ نَفْسًا او علماً او اباً. "THE (noun of) SPECIFICATION *is always indefinite,* and *is placed after a noun of* NUMBER, MEASURE, WEIGHT, DISTANCE, &c., *in which the signification is vague, in order to render it* SPECIFIC: *as, twenty* MEN, *two measures* (termed قفيز) (of) WHEAT, Two *pounds* (of) FAT, Two *measures* (termed جريب) (of) COTTON: *or, when speaking of a single date* (fruit, *saying*) زُبداً THE CREAM. *It is also used when quantity is not meant: as, a ring* (of) IRON, *a bracelet* (of) GOLD. *It sometimes comes after a sentence, in order to mark the thing referred to with the greater precision: as, Zaid* (is) *fortunate* (in) PERSON, *or,* LEARNING, *or* (in his) FATHER." The following is the account given of it in

immediate apposition: אֲנָשִׁים מְעַט *men, a* FEW, i. e. *a few men,* Neh. ii. 12; אֲמָרִים אֱמֶת *words,* TRUTH, i. e. *true words,* Prov. xxii. 21: שֶׂה בְּרִיָה *a sheep,* FATNESS, i. e. *fat sheep,* Ezek. xxxiv. 20.

2d, Examples, in which the latter designates the materials, metal, &c. out of which the first is made: כִּכָּרִים הַבָּקָר* כֶּסֶף *two talents* (of) SILVER, 2 Kings v. 23;

---

the *Alfia* of Ibn Málik: اِسْمٌ بِمَعْنَي مِنْ مُبِيْنٍ نَكِرَهْ. يَنْصِبُ تَمْيِيزاً بِمَا قَدْ فَسَّرَهْ. كَشِبْرٍ أَرْضاً وَقَفِيزٍ بُرّاً. وَمَنَوِيْنٍ عَسَلاً وَتَمْراً. i. e. A noun which, in the signification of مِن *of*, explains something that is vague, is placed, for the sake of specification, in juxta-position with the word so restricted: as, *a span* (of) EARTH; a *measure* (termed قفيز) *of* WHEAT; *two pounds of* HONEY, or *of* DATE FRUIT.

According to the opinion of El Akhfash, الاخفش, and Soheili سهيلي, as recorded by El Azheri (Schnabell's Com. on the *Agrúmia*, p. ٨٣) and condemned by him, this construction is to be considered as a species of the *Izáfat*, or definite state of construction; which is no doubt erroneous.

* We have a construction, perfectly parallel to this, which M. de Sacy has put down in his Gram. Arabe, (vol. ii. p. 110.), as being anomalous: it is given in these examples: viz. القرامي الخشب *the billets, the wood,* i. e. *the wooden billets.* So الصلبان الخشب, الخراريب الذهب and السروج الخشب. So in the tale of *Sindbad,* by Langlés, الخبز الشعير p. ٤٥, and without the article لوح خشب, p. ١٦. There is no reason, however, for supposing, as M. de Sacy does, that this construction is modern; nor, that these are to be considered as nouns in the *definite* state of construction. The fact is, they are mere nouns in apposition, and involve the rhetorical figure which the Arabs term بَدَل, and we, EPANORTHOSIS.

הַנְּחֹשֶׁת *the oxen,* THE BRASS, i. e. *brazen,* 2 Kings xvi. 17; טוּרִים אָבֶן *orders* (*rows*) STONE, i. e. *of stone,* Exod. xxviii. 17.

3d, So also, when the latter word signifies the person, thing, &c. numbered, measured, or weighed; and the preceding one the name of the measure, &c.; e. g. שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים *two years,* DAYS, i. e. *the space of two years,* Gen. xli. 1; שָׁבֻעִים יָמִים *weeks,* DAYS, i. e. *the space of certain weeks,* Dan. x. 3; אֵיפָה שְׂעֹרִים *an ephah* (of) BARLEY, Ruth ii. 17; סְאָה־סֹלֶת *a seah* (of) FINE FLOUR, 2 Kings vii. 1.

See also Gen. xv. 1, Num. ix. 19, 20, xxviii. 23, 1 Kings xxii. 17, Neh. ii. 12, Prov. xxii. 21, Is. x. 19, xxx. 20. 33, &c.

4th, Apposition may also take place *mediately,* i. e. when one or more words intervene between the nouns to be thus construed.

Under this rule may be placed all those examples, in which Schrœderus has said, "*Emphatica est construendi ratio,*" &c. (Synt. R. 18.) which, however, are nothing more than words put in *mediate* apposition with others, i. e. having an intervening particle expressed; and which seems to be added rather for the purpose of modifying the signification of the preceding word, than for adding emphasis to the context: e. g. כִּי בְרָע הוּא *for he is* IN *evil,* i. e. *in an unfortunate situation,* Exod. xxxii. 22; בַּקֹּדֶשׁ דַּרְכֶּךָ IN *holiness* (is) *thy way,* Ps. lxxvii. 14; יְהוָה יִהְיֶה בְכִסְלֶךָ *Jehovah* SHALL BE IN (or for) *thy confidence,* Prov.

This construction may also be explained, by supposing the proposition من to be omitted, which has been adopted by El Azherí, الازهري, in his Commentary on the *Agrúmia,* published by Schnabell, p. ٨٣. But I prefer the former method. See also Josh. iii. 14, 2 Kings ix. 4, 1 Chron. xv. 27, 2 Chron. xv. 8, Ps. lix. 6, Jer. xxxviii. 6. In which there seems to be an excess of the definite article, but which may be accounted for without having recourse to the ellipsis as Schrœderus has done. Synt. R. III.

iii. 26; * אֲדֹנָי בְּסֹמְכֵי נַפְשִׁי *the Lord* (is) AMONG *the sustainers of my soul*, Ps. liv. 6.

See also Ps. lxxxix. 14, cxviii. 7, Prov. xvi. 6, Is. xl. 10, Hos. xiii. 9.

5th, Words are sometimes put in the mediate state of apposition by means of a conjunction. This is generally termed Hendiadys. Examples: עִיר וְאֵם *a city* AND *mother*, i. e. a *mother city*, or *metropolis*, 2 Sam. xx. 19; בָּרָמָה וּבְעִירוֹ *in Ramah* AND *in his own city*, i. e. *in his city Ramah*, 1 Sam. xxviii. 3; בִּכְלִי הָרֹעִים וּבַיַּלְקוּט .... *in the shepherds' vessel*, AND *in the bag*, Ib. xvii. 40.

See also Is. xxxvii. 18, 2 Chron. xvi. 14, Ps. lxvi. 20, Dan. iii. 5, viii. 10, &c. And in the New Test. Acts xiv. 13, xxiii. 6, Eph. ii. 3, &c.

On the Nouns of Time and Place.

233. Under this head may be placed certain words, signifying the time or place in which any thing is done, the construction of which in the Arabic is *absolute*;†

---

* M. de Sacy remarks on the expression كَانَ لُقْمَانُ حَكِيماً *Lockman was a wise* (man), Gram. Arab. vol. ii. p. 74. ... "enfin حَكِيماً *sage*, est un terme circonstanciel ou modificatif, un sur attribut ... exprime sous une forme adverbiale, e qui équivaut a بِحَكِيمٍ, ou à وهو حَكِيمٌ." And in a note, "C'est ainsi que l'on peut dire مَا زَيْدٌ كَاذِباً ou بِكَاذِبٍ, ou مِنَ الكَاذِبِينَ; a la lettre, *non Zeidus mendacem*, ou *in menduci*, ou *ex mendacibus*."

† These are termed ظروف المكان والزمان *containers of time and place*: e. g. صوموا أيّاماً معدودةً *fast ye* (for) *days numbered*; أمام المسجد *before the mosque*, Gram. Arab. M. de Sacy, vol. ii. p. 59. 60, &c.

these words, are, therefore, construed by them as being in the objective case, and not standing in need of any intervening particle: e. g. שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים *two years* (as to) DAYS, the space of two years, Gen. xli. 1; וְהוּא יֹשֵׁב פֶּתַח־הָאֹהֶל *and he standing* (in) THE OPENING *of the tent*, Gen. xviii. 1; וְעָמַד פֶּתַח הָאֹהֶל *and it stood* (at) THE OPENING *of the tent*, Exod. xxxiii. 9; עֹמְדִים מִזְרָח לַמִּזְבֵּחַ *standing* (at) THE EASTERN PART *of the altar*, 2 Chron. v. 12.

As the construction of the numerals will occasionally require the application of our other principle, which we have termed that of "*definite construction*," its consideration will be postponed till we come to treat on that subject.

The preposition, however, is sometimes used: e. g. יִתְיַצְּבוּ בְּתַחְתִּית הָהָר *they stood* BENEATH *the mount*, Exod. xix. 18.

2d, In all these cases, as the qualifying word seems to have no *formal* connection with the word qualified, its position may be termed *absolute*: and, in this point of view, it may be said to have the same relation to the word qualified, that an adverb has when used for the purpose of qualifying a verb.

3d, We sometimes find a pronoun joined with the first of such nouns: as, מְדֹו בָד HIS GARMENT (of) *linen*, Lev. vi. 3; מַחְסִי־עֹז MY REFUGE (of) *strength*, Ps. lxxi. 7.

See also 1 Sam. xxii. 13, Is. xxxi. 7, Lam. iv. 17, Ezek. xvi. 27, &c.*

4th, Attributives in Hebrew being considered as including some substantive in their signification (see Art. 230. 7.), need not, when put in apposition with other substantives, be made to agree with them *formally*,

---

* Examples of this description have been improperly laid down by Schrœderus as being in the *definite* state of construction. Synt. R. 10.

in the same gender and number: e. g. עוֹלָה כָּלִיל *an offering, a* COMPLETE ONE, i. e. *a complete offering,* 1 Sam. vii. 9; בָּשָׂר בַּשָּׂדֶה טְרֵפָה *flesh in the field,* TORN (flesh) i. e. *flesh torn in the field,* Exod. xxii. 30; לְעַם לְצִיִּים *for a people, for* THE DESERT-ONES, i. e. *for those inhabiting the desert,* Ps. lxxiv. 14.

See also Gen. xxiii. 3, Exod. xxix. 22, Deut. xiii. 17, 1 Kings xix. 11, Ps. xvii. 13, lxxiii. 10, Ecc. xii. 13, Cant. iv. 2, Jer. xx. 9, xxi. 13, Ezek. viii. 3, xxix. 1.

5th, When, however, attributives are put in apposition with substantives, they must agree with them *in a logical point of view* at least; i. e. if the substantive is either definite or indefinite in signification, the attributive must also be made definite or indefinite. As to number and gender, the agreement is that of a predicate with its subject (see Art. 228, &c.). And, with respect to the order, it will be the same as before (Art. 226. 3.): e. g. אִישׁ חָכָם *a man,* WISE, 2 Sam. xiii. 3; שׁוּחָה עֲמֻקָּה *a ditch,* DEEP, Prov. xxiii. 27; רַבִּים צַיָּדִים MANY *hunters,* Jer. xvi. 16; הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה *the words,* THESE, Gen. xlviii. 1; הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת *the land,* THIS, Ib. v. 4; בָּנֶיךָ הַנּוֹלָדִים *thy sons,* THE BORN ONES, Ib. v. 5.

6th, Pronouns have the property of making the words to which they are attached definite; and hence, in the last example, the article is necessarily affixed to the attribute נוֹלָדִים. Hence also, it is only when the antecedent is definite, that the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, or any equivalent term, being also definite, ought in any case to be introduced: e. g. הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר נָתַתָּה עִמָּדִי THE *woman,* WHOM *thou hast placed with me,* Gen. iii. 12; מִי־זֶה רֹעֶה אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹד *who* (is) THIS *shepherd* WHO *standeth?* Jer. xlix. 19; מִי־הָאִישׁ הַלָּזֶה הַהֹלֵךְ *who* (is) THIS MAN, THE (one) *walking,* Gen. xxiv. 65. But, to this rule, there are many exceptions.

7th, In some instances, however, the attribute appears to be made definite, when the preceding substantive is not so: as, בְּיַד מַלְאָכִים הַבָּאִים *by the hand of messengers,* THE *coming ones,* Jer. xxvii. 3; עֲבָדִים הַפְּחָחֲרָצִים *servants,* THE *runaways,* 1 Sam. xxv. 10. But, in these cases, we seem to have an *Epanorthosis:* as, in the first case,—*I mean those who are coming,* &c. (see Art. 229. 4.).

8th, In other cases, the latter is without the article when the first is not: as, הַדּוּד אֶחָד THE *basket, one,* Jer. xxiv. 2; לְעֵינֵי הַגּוֹיִם רַבִּים *in the eyes of* THE *nations, many,* Ezek. xxxix. 27; אֶת־הָעֲגָלָה חֲדָשָׁה *the new cart,* 2 Sam. vi. 3. But, in these instances, we have probably an ellipsis of one of the words so connected: e. g. הַדּוּד דּוּד אֶחָד *as to the basket, one basket,* &c.: or, the latter word may be considered as *specific:* in which case the article is necessarily omitted; and so of the rest.

9th, Proper names are definite in their own right: they do not, therefore, receive the article. Nor will two nouns in the state of definite construction admit of the article being prefixed to the first: as, הַדְּבַר יְהוָה or הַדְּבַר הַמֶּלֶךְ: because, in all these cases, the last word, whether it be a proper name, and therefore definite in itself, or, an appellative with an article, is added for the purpose of defining the first; which will not then admit of being made still more so, by the further addition of the article.

10th, There are, however, many examples in which this doctrine about the force of the article seems to be contravened, and in order to be able to account for these, it becomes necessary here to consider the principles by which the use of the article is regulated.

11th, The article, then, seems to be used for two purposes generally (Art. 193. 14.): one, to point out any person or thing already mentioned or well known: as, הָאָרֶץ *the earth,* Gen. i. 2, which had just been mentioned; or, הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *the sun.* The other, to restrict the bearing of any generic, abstract, or other noun, to the peculiar *property, quality,* &c. expressed by such word; which may hence be considered as an individual, event, &c. thus distinctly characterised, rather than as including the whole class in a general or vague manner, as would

otherwise be the case: e. g. Gen. xviii. 25, חָלִלָה לְךָ מֵעֲשֹׂת כַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה לְהָמִית צַדִּיק עִם־רָשָׁע וְהָיָה כַצַּדִּיק כָּרָשָׁע *far be it from thee to do after this manner, to put to death* RIGHTEOUS *and* EVIL; *so,* THOSE WHO ARE TRULY RIGHTEOUS *shall become as* THOSE WHO ARE WICKED: or, *and thus* THE TRULY RIGHTEOUS MAN *shall be* (considered hereafter) *as* THE WICKED ONE. So Ib. xiii. 7, וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַפְּרִזִּי אָז יֹשֵׁב בָּאָרֶץ *and* THE CANAANITE *and* THE PERIZZITE *dwelt then in the land.* So also with respect to abstract nouns: 1 Kings vii. 14, וַיִּמָּלֵא אֶת־הַחָכְמָה וְאֶת־הַתְּבוּנָה וְאֶת־הַדַּעַת לַעֲשׂוֹת כָּל־מְלָאכָה בַּנְּחֹשֶׁת *and, he is filled with* SUCH WISDOM, *and* INTELLIGENCE, *and* KNOWLEDGE, (as are necessary) *for making all work in brass,** &c. See also Gen. xxiii. 17, חָעֵץ; Deut. xxxii. 4, הַצּוּר; 2 Sam. xii. 7, הָאִישׁ, &c.

12th, The reason of the rule seems to be this. These generic, or abstract, nouns may be considered as proper *names* for the ideas for which they severally stand; and, therefore, as being definite within themselves to a certain degree. But, as they may stand for any individual of the species to which they belong, and, likewise, for every individual, they may also represent whole classes. In this case, the addition of the definite article can affect their signification in no other way, than by giving a sort of importance, not to such class or individual, but to the *property* expressed by its name. And, *vice versâ,* any proper name receiving the definite article, will necessarily become an attribute expressive of the properties, &c. expressed by such name.

---

* This appears to me to be equivalent to the use of the Arabic and Persian ي, which is termed جنسي *of kind*: as, اِبْرَاهِيمِي *one like Abraham, faithful;* حَاطِمِي *one liberal as Hatim Tai*: which is sometimes also preceded by آن in the Persian; as, آن كريمي *that bountiful one, such a bountiful one.* See M. de Sacy's notes on the Pend-namèh of Attar, p. 13.

13th, Hence, we find words used as proper names, sometimes with, and at others, without, the definite article: e. g. הַיַּרְדֵּן *the Jordan*, Jer. xii. 5, xlix. 19; but Job xl. 23, &c. יַרְדֵּן *Jordan*; הַיְאֹר *the Nile*, Gen. xli. 1, 2. 18; but יְאֹר Isa. xix. 7, xxiii. 3, Zech. x. 11; הַלְּבָנוֹן *the Libanus*, Deut. iii. 25, &c.; but Ps. xxix. 6, &c. לְבָנוֹן as a proper name; הַכַּרְמֶל 1 Sam. xv. 12, &c. but כַּרְמֶל Josh. xv. 55. So הַבָּשָׁן and בָּשָׁן, הַפְּעוֹר and פְּעוֹר. So also in the names of men: הָעֲנָק Num. xiii. 22. 28, but עֲנָק Deut. ix. 2; הָאֲרוֹנָה 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; הַמָּגוֹג Ezek. xxxviii. 2, &c.* See Nold. Concord. Part. annot. and vind. p. 855, &c.

14th, This sometimes takes place also, when a proper name is compounded of two words put in the definite state of construction: as, קִרְיַת הָאַרְבַּע Neh. xi. 25, but קִרְיַת אַרְבַּע Gen. xxiii. 2. So קִרְיַת הַיְעָרִים Jer. xxvi. 20, but קִרְיַת יְעָרִים Josh. ix. 17, &c.

15th, A case similar to this occurs in the Arabic, though not in proper names, which has given endless trouble to the Grammarians who have attempted to explain it. See the Shurho Moolla Jámi, pp. ٢١. ٢١١. The examples are جَانِبُ الغَرْبِيِّ, مَسْجِدُ الجَامِعِ, صَلوٰةُ الاُولَى, and بَقْلَةُ الحَمْقَا. Now, if we consider the last word, in each of these cases, as being an attribute including a substantive noun in its signification, just as the Moolla himself has taught us (Art. 230. 7.), we shall have nothing more than two nouns in the definite state of construction: as, *the mosque of the worshippers*, &c.

---

* In the كتاب المظهر في اللغة by Essoyuti, we have the following remark to this effect: فان قيل فالفرات ايضاً معرفة فلم دخلته الالف واللام فالجواب ان ذلك جايز في كل معرفة اصله الوصف كالعباس والحارث والفرات هو الماء العذب قال تعالي واسقيناكم ماءً فُرَاتًا. *If it be said, Why is* EL FARAT, *with the article, when its addition is not allowable? The answer is, that this is allowable in all proper names, the origin of which is* AN ATTRIBUTIVE: *as,* العباس EL ABAS; الحارث EL HARITH. *And as to* EL FARAT, *its signification is,* THE SWEET WATER: *as it is said in the Koran, "And we will surely water you with sweet water."* (Sur. 77.).

The solution offered by the Moolla is incapable of affording any idea, as far as I can see, viz. مسجد الوقت الجامع.

16th, For the Moolla's account of the usage of the article just noticed, see the Shurh ul Káfia, p. ٣٢٠, &c. where he tells us, that the word الاسد *El Asad*, although with the definite article, is to be taken as being indefinite. Compare 1 Sam. xvii. 34, הָאַרְיֵ and הַדֹּב, put for *a lion*, and *a bear*, not *the lion*, &c. See also Mr. de Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. i. pp. 326—8, vol. ii. p. 276, &c.

17th, Some appellatives which are much in use, seem to take the article by way of distinction: as, הַבְּאֵר *the well*, Exod. ii. 15; הַנַּעַר *the servant*, Gen. xviii. 7, &c., just as we use the correspondent words in English, without intending to make the word definite. For a similar reason perhaps others omit it: as, מֶלֶךְ רַב *great king*, for *the great king*, Ps. xxi. 2, xlv. 16, xlviii. 3, xlix. 7, lxii. 1, Est. i. 9. So שָׁמֶשׁ for הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ Ps. lxxii. 17, Jer. xxxi. 35, &c. So אֶרֶץ for הָאָרֶץ Ps. ii. 2, Job iii. 14, xxxv. 11, &c.; and אֱלֹהִים frequently for הָאֱלֹהִים.

234. Words generally construed as adverbs are nothing more than verbal nouns, attributes, or particles, put in *immediate*, or *mediate*, apposition with those which they are intended to qualify.* The order is regulated as before (Art. 226. 3.). Examples of such words in *immediate* apposition: פָּקוֹד פָּקַדְתִּי *visiting*,† *I have*

---

* The construction is here, as before, *absolute*, when immediate. This is termed by the Arabian Grammarians الحال i. e. *the state;* and, as with them it consists of one or more words added for the purpose of qualifying either the subject or object of a verb, it must necessarily be an attributive. Mr. de Sacy seems to have confounded the حال with the تمييز. The principle, however, is the same in both.

† Ibn Malik says on the use of the Infinitive thus added, المفعول المطلق. توكيداً أو نوعا بيين أو عدد. كسرت سيرتين سير ذي رشد "It is selected for the purpose of giving emphasis, or specifying, or to intimate number: as, *I went two journeys*, or, *on a journey of observation.*"

visited (or will surely visit); וַיִּגַּשׁ הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי הַשְׁכֵּם וְהַעֲרֵב *so the Philistine approaches* EARLY *and* LATE, 1 Sam. xvii. 16.

See also Gen. iv. 25, xxiii. 17, Exod. iii. 15, xxxii. 8, Deut. xi. 17, xxxii. 12, xxxiv. 10, Josh. vii. 20, Jud. xiii. 8, 1 Kings xxi. 27, 2 Kings xix. 17, Neh. ii. 2, Job xxxiii. 3, Ps. xxv. 3, Prov. xv. 24, xxxi. 9, Jer. xlviii. 10, Dan. viii. 9, Mic. ii. 8, &c. with passive verbal nouns, Gen. xvii. 13, xl. 15, Lev. xix. 20, Num. xi. 4, 1 Sam. ii. 27, 2 Sam. xvii. 10, 1 Kings xx. 39. So with adjectives or substantives: see Gen. xxxviii. 28, Eccl. vii. 16, Dan. xi. 3, 1 Chron. xxix. 9, Jer. li. 39, &c.

2d, Examples of such words in *mediate* apposition with others, i. e. with some particle or other word or words intervening: יִתֵּן־אֹכֶל לְמַכְבִּיר *he giveth food to abundance,* i. e. abundantly, Job xxxvi. 31; יִבְרְחוּ בְּהֶחָבֵא *they fled in becoming hidden,* i. e. secretly, Dan. x. 7.

See also Gen. iv. 15, Exod. xxv. 20. Numb. x. 31, Josh. xxiv. 14, Jud. vi. 22, ix. 16, 19, 2 Sam. iii. 27, xviii. 5, Job xxxiv. 27, Ps. ix. 9, xxxi. 24, Isa. xxvi. 13, xxxii. 1, Jer. v. 2, vi. 14, viii. 11, xxxviii. 4, Hos. ii. 20, Mic. vii. 3, Zech. xi. 7.

3d, In all these cases, *specification* is obviously the purpose for which such words have been introduced. With verbs, these will necessarily be construed as adverbs; but, with nouns, as adjectives, attributes, or the like. The addition of the particle can have no other influence than that of making the passage more specific, or in some way or other modifying it.

4th, Hence, when it is necessary to express the *commencement, repetition, hurry, progress, the ability of effecting, intensity, certainty,* &c. of any action, passion, &c. it may be done, either by putting two verbs in the tense and person suitable to the passage, with or without the copulative conjunction; or, by one verb only in such tense and person, and the other, either in the Infinitive, or in the Participial, form:* e. g. הָחֵל רָשׁ

* This, according to the Moolla Jámi, is done either for the purpose of

begin, possess, i. e. begin to possess, Deut. ii. 31; וַיָּחֶל נֹחַ . . . וַיִּטַּע כָּרֶם *so Noah begins . . . . and plants a vineyard,* i. e. to plant, Gen. ix. 20; לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לָךְ *do not repeat* (that) *they call thee,* i. e. do not allow them again to call thee, Is. xlvii. 1; וַיֹּסֶף שַׁלַּח *and he repeats sending,* i. e. he sends again, Gen. viii. 10; לֹא אֹסִף לְקַלֵּל *I add not to curse,* i. e. I will not curse again, Ib. v. 21; וַתְּמַהֵר וַתּוֹרֶד *so she hastes and puts down,* i. e. hastens to put down, Gen. xxiv. 18; מַדּוּעַ מְהַרְתֶּן בֹּא *why have you hasted coming,* i. e. to come, Exod. ii. 18; וְדָוִד הֹלֵךְ וְחָזֵק וּבֵית שָׁאוּל הֹלְכִים וְדַלִּים *so David* (was) *proceeding and becoming strong; but the house of Saul* (was) *proceeding and becoming weak,* i. e. David becomes gradually stronger, &c. 2 Sam. iii. 1; אוּכַל נַכֶּה־בּוֹ *I may be able* (that) *we may smite him,* Num. xxii. 6; נִפְרְצָה נִשְׁלְחָה *let us spread out, let us send,* i. e. let us send out extensively, 1 Chron. xiii. 2.

See also Gen. viii. 3. 5, xii. 9. 11, xxv. 1, xxvi. 13. 18, xxx. 31, xxxvii. 33, Exod. xix. 19, Jud. iv. 24, 1 Sam. ii. 26, iv. 14, xiv. 19,

---

rousing the hearer, or to prevent mistake (Com. on Ibn ul Hájib, p. ٢٣٥-٢.). His words are: وذلك اما لدفع ضرر الغفلة عن السامع اولدفع ظنه بالمتكلم الغلط. وذلك الدفع يكون بتكرير اللفظ نحو ضرب زيد زيد او ضرب ضرب زيد: "and this," he adds, "is done by repeating the word: as, *He struck* (i. e.) *Zaid, Zaid*: or, *he struck, he struck* (i. e.) *Zaid.* But, it is not to the repetition of the same words that this rule is confined, any other words may be added, as the sense may require. So Zúzení on the Moallakah of Antara Ed. Menil. v. 5: الاقواء والاقفار . . . جمع بينهما لضرب من التاكيد كما قال طرفة متي ادن منه ينأ عني ويبعد i. e. The becoming *void* and *desert.* These words are conjoined for the purpose of strengthening the passage, just as the poet Tarafat has said, When I come near him, he *wanders* and *separates* from me."

xvii. 41, xix. 8, 2 Sam. xviii. 25, Is. vi. 13, xlix. 4, Jer. xii. 2, xiii. 18, Hos. ix. 9, Jonah i. 11, Ps. xxxiii. 3, lxxviii. 38, cxiii. 5; and, for the New Testament, see Glass. pp. 273, 275—6, 277—9, &c.

5th, The repetition of nouns or particles is often recurred to, for the purpose of denoting *distribution, diversity, comparison,* or the like: e. g. שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם בָּאוּ אֶל־נֹחַ TWO (and) TWO *came they to Noah,* Gen. vii. 9; בֵּין עֵדֶר וּבֵין עֵדֶר *between flock and between flock,* Gen. xxxii. 17: וַיְלַקְטוּ אֹתוֹ בַבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר *and let them collect it* MORNING *by* MORNING, Exod. xvi. 21; אֶבֶן וָאֶבֶן גְּדוֹלָה וְקָטַנָּה STONE *and* STONE, *a great and a small* (one), i. e. diverse weights, Deut. xxv. 13; בְּלֵב וָלֵב יְדַבֵּרוּ *in* HEART *and* HEART *they speak,* i. e. while they profess one thing they mean another, Ps. xii. 3; וְהָיָה כָעָם כַּכֹּהֵן כָּעֶבֶד כַּאדֹנָיו *it shall be,* LIKE *people* LIKE *priest,* LIKE *servant* LIKE *master,* &c., Isa. xxiv. 2; כְּכֹחִי אָז וּכְכֹחִי עָתָּה *as my* STRENGTH (was) *then,* EVEN SO (is) *my* STRENGTH *now,* Jos. xiv. 11.

See also Gen. vii. 2, xviii. 25, xliv. 18, xlvii. 3. 19, Exod. vii. 19, xiv. 20, Deut. xxv. 13, Jud. viii. 18, 1 Sam. xxx. 24, 1 Kings xiv. 5, xx. 40, xxii. 4. 20, 2 Kings iii. 7, Is. xvi. 7, Ezek. xviii. 4, xxxvii. 7, Ps. xx. 8, cxxxix. 12, Prov. xx. 10. 23, Eccl. iii. 19, 1 Chron. ix. 27. 32, 2 Chron. xiii. 11.

6th, When, however, the demonstrative pronouns are used; or, a singular personal pronoun, referring to an antecedent in the plural number, distribution is generally intended: e. g. זֶה אֶל־זֶה *this to this,* i. e. one to another, Exod. xiv. 20; גָּדֵר מִזֶּה וְגָדֵר מִזֶּה *a wall from this, and a wall from this,* i. e. on each side, Num. xxii. 24; כִּי־תֵצֵא לַמִּלְחָמָה עַל־אֹיְבֶךָ וּנְתָנוֹ יְהוָה *when thou goest to the war against thy enemies, and Jehovah shall give* HIM, i. e. *wholly, or every one of them,* Deut. xxi. 10; וַתִּקַּח הָאִשָּׁה אֶת־שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים וַתִּצְפְּנוֹ *so the woman takes* BOTH OF THE MEN *and hides* HIM, i. e. *wholly,* or *each one* of them, Josh. ii. 4.

See also, for the first case, 1 Kings xxii. 20, Ps. xx. 8: for the second, 2 Kings iii. 3, Ps. xxxv. 8, &c.

7th, The context will generally be sufficient to inform us, whether we are to consider these repetitions as emphatical, or distributive. There are, however, other instances of repetition, which fall under neither of the preceding heads, but which are to be ascribed to the simple and unpolished usage of a venerable antiquity. Such is the repetition of the word לֵאמֹר 1 Kings ii. 4, &c. Of whole sentences: as, Gen. vi. 22, xiii. 5, 6, xiv. 5, 8, xxiv. 37, 1 Sam. x. 9. The introduction of words apparently superfluous: as, "*he lifted up his eyes, feet,*" &c. Gen. xiii. 10, xviii. 2, xxix. 1, Dan. x. 5: "*he put forth his hand,*" Gen. viii. 9, 2 Kings vi. 7, &c.; "*they arose,*" Jos. xviii. 4; "*and it came to pass,*" וַיְהִי, וְהָיָה; and "*behold,*" הִנֵּה passim.

Of the emphatic repetition of Words or Phrases.

235. If, upon the addition of one word or phrase, another will be made more definite, specific, &c., then, also, upon the repetition of either, a still greater definiteness, perspicuity, energy, fervency, or the like, will be given to the context:* e. g. שׁוּבוּ שׁוּבוּ מִדַּרְכֵיכֶם הָרָעִים TURN YE, TURN YE, *from your evil ways,* Ezek. xxxiii. 11; רִיבוּ בְאִמְּכֶם רִיבוּ CONTEND *with your mother,* CONTEND YE, Hos. ii. 4; הֵיכַל יְהוָה הֵיכַל יְהוָה הֵיכַל יְהוָה הֵמָּה THE TEMPLE OF JEHOVAH, THE TEMPLE OF JEHOVAH, THE TEMPLE OF JEHOVAH (are) *these,* Jer. vii. 4.

I. e. They insisted that the idols, which were called *temples,* (هَيَاكِلُ, see Pococke's Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 91.) REALLY contained the Deity. For similar expressions, see Is. xxxviii. 19, xliii. 25, Ps. xciv. 3, Cant. vii. 1, &c.

2d, So with the pronouns: מִשְׂגַּבִּי וּמַפַלְטִי־לִי *my high*

---

* For similar examples in the Arabic, see Mr. de Sacy's Gram. vol. ii. Art. 671— 2—676; Moolla Jámi's Commentary on the Kafia, p. ٢٢٥. And with the pronouns, Mr. de Sacy's Gram. vol. ii. pp. 359, 360.

tower, and MY *deliverer* FOR ME, i. e. *my sure deliverer,* Ps. cxliv. 2; מִי יִתֵּן מוֹתִי אֲנִי תַּחְתֶּיךָ *who will put* MY DEATH, MINE, *in the place of thine!* i. e. *O that some one had slain me, even me, instead of thee!* 2 Sam. xix. 1; וּפִגְרֵיכֶם אַתֶּם יִפֹּלוּ *and* YOUR *carcases* (even) YOURS *shall fall,* Num. xiv. 32. See Art. 232. 5.

And generally, see Gen. xvii. 9. 14, xxvii. 34, Ex. xii. 17. 20, xiv. 11, xv. 16, Lev. xxvi. 14, Num. vi. 9, xii. 2, Deut. iv. 9, xx. 3, 1 Kings xxi. 19, Is. v. 9. 27, xxiv. 19, xxix. 5, xxx. 13, lii. 13, Jer. xxvii. 7, xlvi. 13, xlviii. 29, li. 56, Joel iv. 4, Zeph. ii. 1, Hag. i. 4, Zech. viii. 4, Ps. vi. 11, ix. 7, Prov. v. 22, xiii. 4, Job xxix. 3, xxxiii. 20. So מַשְׁעֵן וּמַשְׁעֶנֶת, masc. and fem., i. e. every species of support, Is. iii. 1. See the Concessus of Hariri by Schultens, p. 36, and the Moallakah Antaræ, by Menil (Lugd. Bat. 1816.), v. 71, وشيظم شيظمة, with the Scholia of Zúzení, at p. 113.

3d, Hence, also, words put in the plural number, (which according to our system, consists of the juxtaposition of two words) may be considered as being emphatical: e. g. אֱלֹהִים *God;* אֲדֹנִים *Lord;* בְּעָלִים *Baal;* עַשְׁתָּרוֹת *Ashtaroth, Venus;* בְּהֵמוֹת *the Behemoth;* חָכְמוֹת *real wisdom,* &c. by way of eminence.

On Nouns put in the Definite State of Construction.

236. Of this construction or regimen, as it has been sometimes called, there are two kinds (see Art. 230. 7.). The first we have termed the *definite,* the second, the *distinctive, state of construction;* merely to denote the different kinds of words thus used.

2d, Of the *definite* state of construction we may reckon two kinds: viz. the *Immediate,* and the *Mediate.* The *Immediate* is that which presents two or more substantive nouns (not being names for the same thing), so connected, that the idea thus conveyed becomes sufficiently defined for the purposes of the speaker or

writer. The *Mediate* is that, in which this is done by the intervention of one or more of the particles.*

3d, Examples of nouns in the *definite state of construction* termed *Immediate:* שַׂר־צְבָאוֹ *captain* (of) *his host,* 1 Sam. xxvi. 5; מְנֻשֵׁי בְנֵי־הַנְּבִיאִים *of the wives* (of) *the sons* (of) *the prophets,* 2 Kings iv. 1; נְהַר־פְּרָת *the river* (of) *Euphrates,* Gen. xv. 18; קִרְיַת חֻצוֹת *the town* (of) *Khuzoth,* Num. xxii. 39; בְּתוּלַת בַּת־עַמִּי *the virgin* (of) *the daughter* (of) *my people,* Jer. xiv. 17.

4th, In these, and all similar passages, this juxta-position of words has the property of *defining* the idea presented by the first, precisely in the same manner with that kind of apposition, to which we have given the term *Identity.* In the following, the idea, presented by the first of the words so placed, is made more *distinct* or *specific,* just as it is by that state of apposition which we have termed *specific.* It will readily be seen, that the distinctions here mentioned can arise only from the consideration of the *sense* of the qualifying terms in each

---

* The truth is, however, the *particles* themselves are really nouns, as already intimated; and, when they intervene, the construction is either that of *apposition,* or, of what we have here termed *definite* construction, or both. We have adopted the term *mediate,* both here and in Art. 230. 5. in order to conform to the usual mode of considering these skeletons of words. Hereafter, perhaps, we may get rid of this distinction.—According to the doctrine of the Arabian Grammarians, every example of *immediate construction* that can occur, may be resolved by an equivalent *mediate* one: e. g. غُلَامُ زَيْدٍ *the slave of Zaid,* is, according to them, perfectly equivalent to غُلَامٌ لِزَيْدٍ. So خَاتَمُ فِضَّةٍ, to خَاتَمٌ مِنْ فِضَّةٍ *a ring of* (or out of) *silver;* and ضَرْبُ اليَوْمِ to ضَرْبٌ وَاقِعٌ فِي اليَوْمِ i. e. *a stroke,* or *blow, of to-day,* to *a stroke,* or *blow, happening to-day.* See the Shurho Moolla Jámi, printed at Calcutta, p. ٢٠٢, &c. This process, according to my notions, is making the construction less simple than it stood originally; or, in other words, is making a plain matter difficult, by placing a greater number of words in construction than in the original example. It shews, however, that both signify the same thing.

case. Examples: בִּגְדֵי קֹדֶשׁ *garments* (of) *holiness*, i. e. *holy*, or *sacred, garments*, Exod. xxix. 29; אֶבֶן .... צֶדֶק *a stone*, or *weight* (of) *justice*, i. e. *a just weight*, Deut. xxv. 15; אֵשֶׁת נְעוּרִים *a wife* (of) *youth*, i. e. *a young wife*, Isa. liv. 6. See also Gen. xli. 42, Exod. xi. 2, Jud. viii. 13, 1 Sam. i. 11, Jer. xi. 20, &c.

5th, The case will be the same should a sentence stand in the place of the qualifying word:* e. g. שִׂפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֶשְׁמָע *a lip (or language* which) *I knew not, I heard*, Ps. lxxxi. 6; יִתְרַת עָשָׂה אָבָדוּ *the acquisition* (of that which) *he made, they have lost*, Jer. xlviii. 36; בִּידֵי לֹא אוּכַל קוּם *into the hands* (of those) *I am not able to rise* against, Lam. i. 14. See Ps. lxv. 5, cxxix. 6, Jer. ii. 8, &c.

6th, This construction, however, will admit of more than one solution. For, first, if we consider the particles, &c. as *nouns*, which I believe we ought to do, then we have nothing more than an *immediate* state of construction here, with the preceding word in the proper form for such a state (Art. 179.). And, 2d, if we suppose that the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר *who, which*, &c. has been omitted by the ellipsis, which has been preferred by Schrœderus, the construction will also be explained.

7th, In some cases, however, the order is found to be inverted, which has been termed Hypallage: e. g. כֶּסֶף סִיגִים *argentum scoriarum*, for scoriæ argenti, Prov. xxvi. 23; קׇרְבַּן הָעֵצִים *oblatio lignorum*, for ligna oblationum. See also Lev. v. 15, vii. 21, xxii. 4, Deut. xii. 3, Josh. ii. 6, 1 Kings xvii. 14, Ezek. xxi. 30, Est. ix. 19.

8th, As the perspicuity of these passages greatly depends upon the juxta-position of the words employed, should it be necessary further to define or qualify them by the addition of any pronoun, &c., it will generally be

---

* A similar practice exists in the Persian with respect to the vowels which mark the state of construction: e. g. دلِ بر داشتن کاریست مشکل *of taking up the heart, it is a difficult thing*, i. e. *the heart's disentanglement*, &c. So اِرادَتِ بِي چُون *the will of* (him who is) *without a when*, i. e. *is eternal*. But in these cases both بر داشتن and بي چون may also be considered as nouns.

added to the last: e. g. הַר קָדְשִׁי *the mountain* (of) *my holiness,* i. e. *my holy mountain,* Ps. ii. 6; פְּסִילֵי כַסְפֵּךְ *the images* (of) *thy silver,* i. e. *thy silver images,* Is. xxx. 22; עַמֵּי הַתּוֹעֵבוֹת הָאֵלֶּה *the peoples* (of) *abominations, these,* i. e. *these abominable people,* Ezra ix. 14.

See also Exod. xxviii. 38, Neh. ix. 14, Ps. iv. 2, lix. 18, cx. 2, cxix. 123, Is. ii. 20, xxx. 22, xxxi. 7, Dan. ix. 24. For similar constructions in the New Testament, see Rom. vii. 24, Col. i. 13, &c.

9th, In the preceding examples, the qualified and qualifying noun have been considered as being in juxta-position with one another; but, after all, this is neither necessary, nor is it always the case; for, in some instances, we have the intervention of particles, such as the definite article, &c.; in others, whole words or phrases: e. g. עֲשׂוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶרֶץ וְשָׁמַיִם THE LORD GOD'S *making* (of) *the earth and heavens,* Gen. ii. 4; מִשְׁלֹחַ מָנוֹת אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ THE SENDING GIFTS *of each man to his friend,* Est. ix. 19; בְּשָׁלְחַ אֹתוֹ סַרְגוֹן IN SARGON'S *sending him,* Is. xx. 1.

See also Gen. vii. 6, Jos. xx. 3, Isa. v. 24, xx. 1, Prov. xxv. 8, &c. Storr thinks, that these examples are not to be considered as being in the state of construction, but to be accounted for in some other way (Observ. p. 282.). I believe it is of little importance whether we consider them in this point of view, or as being in apposition with the preceding noun, or otherwise qualifying it, the end arrived at is precisely the same in every view of the case: the only question here being, whether one or more words do not parenthetically intervene between such qualified and qualifying terms. That such is the case, perhaps, there can be little doubt: and, as the usage of the language, in this particular, is all we wish to ascertain, we need not be very anxious as to the terms used, particularly where no change of vowels or consonants can be appealed to as decisive on the subject. The parallelism of the following passage requires that the construction be considered as *definite:* הוֹי אַשּׁוּר שֵׁבֶט אַפִּי וּמַטֶּה־הוּא בְיָדָם זַעְמִי *O Asshur, the rod of my anger: even the rod is he, for their sake,* or, in their hand, OR *my wrath,** Isa. x. 5.

---

* So in the Arabic كَمَا خَطَّ الكَاتِبُ بِكَفِّ يَوْمًا يَهُودِيٍّ *just as the book was written by the hand, one day, of a Jew.* See Gram. Arab. M. de Sacy, vol. ii. p. 125—6.

10th, Great care should be taken in translating passages found in this state of construction, i. e. in considering whether the last of such words is to be taken in an *active* or *passive* sense: e. g. חֶרְפַּת מוֹאָב *the reproach of Moab*, Zeph. ii. 8, is not to be understood as the reproach afflicting Moab, but that which others suffer from them. So חֶרְפַּת עֲבָדֶיךָ Ps. lxxxix. 51, *the reproach of thy servants*, is that which they suffer, not that which they inflict. In like manner, ... חֲמַס הַיּוֹשְׁבִים *the violence* (exercised by the) *inhabitants*, Ezek. xii. 19; but ... חֲמַס בְּנֵי יְרֻבַּעַל *the violence* (suffered by the) *children of Jerubaal*, Judg. ix. 24. זַעֲקַת־דַּל *the cry of the poor*, Prov. xxi. 13: but זַעֲקַת סְדֹם *the cry* (excited by the oppression) *of Sodom*, Gen. xviii. 20. The same holds good with reference to the pronouns. See Gen. xvi. 15, l. 4, Jer. li. 35, 2 Sam. xvi. 12, Is. xxi. 2, Ps. xcviii. 8, lvi. 13, &c.

11th, The following are examples of what has been termed the "*mediate* state of construction," i. e. when the connexion of nouns, thus situated, is in one way or other defined or modified by the intervention of one or more of the particles:* חֲזִיר מִיָּעַר *a boar out of the forest*, i. e. *of the forest*, or, *a forest boar*, Ps. lxxx. 14; לְאֻמִּים מֵרָחוֹק *people of*, or, *from, a distance*, i. e. distant, Isa. xlix. 1.

See also Exod. i. 14, Ps. xc. 4, Cant. iii. 8, Jer. v. 6, &c. Of this kind are the passages מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד — לְאָסָף — *a psalm of David,— of Asaph*; אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה *which* (is) *Solomon's*, i. e. belonging to Solomon, Cant. i. 1, &c., where the proprietor, author, possessor, or the like, is designated.†

12th, This rule, however, with its exemplifications, coincides with the correspondent one given under the article of *mediate apposition* (Art. 232. 4.), i. e. the preceding word generally suffers no abbre-

---

* If we consider these particles as nouns, which I believe they are, all these cases may be resolved to those of *immediate* construction or apposition, as before.

† It has already been remarked (Art. 236. 2.), that the Arabian Grammarians consider every construction of this kind, as perfectly equivalent in signification to those in which the particle is not introduced. In many cases, however, the particles tend to define the relation more specifically.

viation either in the quantity of its vowels, or in the number of its consonants. The words so connected may, by taking the particle as a noun, all be considered as being in *immediate* apposition. In the following cases, the first so connected is put in the *definite* state of construction, e. g. מַשְׁכִּימֵי בַבֹּקֶר . . . . מְאַחֲרֵי בַּנֶּשֶׁף *those arising early in the morning . . . lingering after the twilight*, Isa. v. 11; יֹשְׁבֵי בְּאֶרֶץ צַלְמָוֶת *dwellers in the land of the shadow of death*, Ib. ix. 1.

See also 2 Sam. i. 21, Ps. ii. 12, lxxxiv. 7, Isa. xiv. 19, xxviii. 9, Jer. xxiii. 23, Ezek. xiii. 2, xxi. 17, &c. So also with the conjunction ו: as, חָכְמַת וְדַעַת *wisdom and knowledge*, Isa. xxxiii. 6. With אֵין: as, פֹּרֵק אֵין מִיָּדָם *there is no deliverer from their hands*, Lam. v. 8.

13th, It must appear from these passages, that the particle here found, so influencing the preceding word, must have been considered as a noun; otherwise it will be exceedingly difficult to conceive why this word should have taken the form for construction (Art. 179.).

On the DISTINCTIVE *State of Construction.**

237. It has been remarked (Art. 230. 7.), that, in this case, the preceding word to be qualified, must always

---

* This kind of construction is termed by the Arabian Grammarians الاضافة اللفظية i. e. *verbal construction*, in order to distinguish between it and that which we have termed "the *definite*," which they style الاضافة المعنوية the *logical*, or, *significant*, *construction*. It is curious enough to observe, that they exemplify this state of construction in three different ways, which may serve to shew, that in fact they all amount to the same thing in meaning: e. g. حسن وجهٌ *handsome* (of) *face*, in *immediate* apposition; حسن وجهٍ *handsome* (of) *face*, in the state of *definite* construction; and حسن وجهًا *id.* when the latter or defining word is put *absolutely*, and construed as a noun of *specification*, تمييز. See M. de Sacy's Arab. Gram. vol. ii. p. 159, &c.

be an attributive. The effect here produced is, that of rendering *distinct* or *specific,* the person or thing designated by this attribute; coinciding in this respect with what has been termed *definite construction:* the qualified word being always an attributive involving the signification of a substantive (Ib.), e. g. גְּדוֹל הָעֵצָה *great* (of) *counsel,* i. e. *a great being, &c.* (of) *counsel,* or *counselling being,* Jer. xxxii. 19; קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל *the holy* (one of) *Israel,* Isa. i. 4; תְּמִימֵי־דָרֶךְ *those perfect* (of) *way,* i. e. *men of perfect way,* Ps. cxix. 1; שְׁפַל־רוּחַ *low* (of) *spirit,* i. e. *an humble man,* Prov. xxix. 23; מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה *the anointed of the Lord,* 2 Sam. i. 14.

See also Gen. xxxv. 29, Exod. xxxv. 22, Ps. xxiv. 4, Isa. i. 21, &c.

2d, Under this general head, may be exemplified certain idiomatical expressions which will frequently meet the Learner in his progress. These are, phrases having אִישׁ *man, each,* בֵּן *son,* בַּעַל *Lord, possessor,* &c.; אַנְשֵׁי, מְתֵי *men,* &c. for the first member, followed by certain others in the definite state of construction: e. g. אִישׁ מָוֶת אָתָּה *thou art a man of death,* i. e. *deserving death,* 1 Kings ii. 26; בֶּן־שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים יְהוֹאָשׁ בְּמָלְכוֹ *the son of seven years* (was) *Joash when his reign* (began), i. e. he was seven years old, 2 Kings xii. 1; בֶּן־מָוֶת הוּא *a son of death* (is) *he,* i. e. he shall die, 1 Sam. xx. 31; אִישׁ שִׂפָתַיִם *a man of lips,* i. e. loquacious, Job xi. 2; אִישׁ דְּבָרִים *a man of words,* i. e. a speaker, Exod. iv. 10; אִישׁ אֱמֶת *a man of truth,* i. e. a true man, Neh. vii. 2; אַנְשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם *the men of name,* i. e. famous, Gen. vi. 4; אַנְשֵׁי־חַיִל *men of might,* i. e. mighty men, Gen. xlvii. 6; מְתֵי מִסְפָּר *men of number,* i. e. few, Gen. xxxiv. 30; אִישׁ בַּעַל שֵׂעָר *a man possessed of hair,* i. e. hairy, 2 Kings i. 8; כָּל־בַּעַל כָּנָף *every* (one) *possessed of wing,* i. e. winged bird, Prov. i. 17.

So אַנְשֵׁי סְדֹם *men of Sodom,* Gen. xix. 4, for *Sodomites.* See Gen.

xxiii. 3, xxiv. 13, Numb. xxi. 28, Josh. xxiv. 11, Judg. ix. 2, x. 1, Jer. ii. 16, Ezek. xvi. 26, Ps. cxlix. 2, Cant. i. 5, &c. And generally, Gen. xiv. 13, xxxvi. 39, xlix. 23, Deut. iii. 18, xxv. 2, 1 Sam. xvi. 18, 2 Sam. ii. 7, xii. 5, Isa. v. 1. 13, Hos. x. 9, Ps. lxxxix. 23, Prov. xv. 8, xxii. 24, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 8, Job xi. 11, xxxiv. 8. 10, Dan. viii. 6, Eccl. vii. 12, &c. To this class may be referred בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים *sons of God, pious persons,* and בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם *daughters of men, low, impious women,* Gen. vi. 2, &c.

On the Construction of the Numerals.

238. The numerals in Hebrew being all substantive nouns are put either in *apposition,* or in the *definite* state of construction, with the word signifying the thing numbered: e. g. In *apposition:* אֵילִם שְׁנָיִם *rams two,* עָרִים שְׁתָּיִם *cities two,* בָּנִים שְׁלֹשָׁה, or שְׁלֹשָׁה בָנִים *sons, three,* or *three, sons.*—In *construction:* שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲנָשִׁים *three,* or, *a triad, of men;* שְׁנֵי בָנִים *two sons;* שְׁתֵּי בָנוֹת *two daughters.*

2d, All the dual and decimal numerals, however, signifying numbers exceeding ten, prefer the state of apposition: snch as, עֶשְׂרִים *twenty;* מָאתַיִם *two hundred,* &c.

On the Concordance of the Numerals with the Thing, &c. numbered.

3d, Generally, the numerals taken from *three to ten,* inclusively, are put in the gender different from that of the thing numbered, perhaps for the sake of variety; and they require the thing, &c. numbered to be in the plural number: e. g. שִׁבְעָה כְבָשִׂים, or שִׁבְעַת כְּבָשִׂים *seven male lambs;* שֶׁבַע כְּבָשׂוֹת *seven female lambs.*

4th, Also, when the numeral signifies any number exceeding *ten*, it may likewise disagree in gender with the thing, &c. to be numbered; while the thing, &c. numbered, will be put in the singular number: e. g. שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה אִישׁ *seventy and seven men*; שְׁבַע עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה *seventeen years*; חָמֵשׁ שָׁנִים וּמְאַת שָׁנָה *five years and a hundred year*, Gen. v. 6.

5th, There is nothing peculiar in the construction of the numerals מֵאָה *an hundred*, and אֶלֶף *a thousand*; other numerals being made to agree with them or not, according to the preceding rules: while they will be put either in apposition or construction, in the singular or plural number, according to those rules: e. g. מְאַת אֶלֶף וּשְׁמֹנִים אָלֶף וְשֵׁשֶׁת־אֲלָפִים וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת *an hundred thousand, and eighty thousand, and six thousands, and four hundreds*, Num. ii. 9.

Other Modes of Construction.

239. In many cases, however, we find, that when the numeral exceeds the number *one*, the thing, &c. numbered is put in the plural, whether the numeral precede or follow it, the gender being as before: e. g. אֵילִם שְׁנֵים־עָשָׂר *rams twelve*, Num. vii. 87; כְּבָשִׂים .... שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר *lambs male .... twelve*, Ib.; שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר פָּרִים *twelve bullocks*, Ib.; עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה פָּרִים *twenty and four bullocks*, Ib. v. 88.

See also Gen. xvii. 20, xxv. 16, xxvi. 12, xxxii. 15. 23, Josh. iv. 2, xxi. 19, 2 Sam. xix. 18, 1 Kings iv. 13, Jer. xxxviii. 10, Ezra viii. 35, &c. And, *vice versâ*, חָמֵשׁ שָׁנָה *five year*, 2 Kings xxii. 1, &c.

2d, The intermediate numbers between ten and twenty, twenty and thirty, &c. are formed upon the principles already investigated in the cases of words added for the purpose of qualifying, specifying, or otherwise restricting, the meaning of others; that is, either by *apposition* or *definite* construction, *immediate* or *mediate*: e. g. שִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר *seventeen*, in *immediate* apposition: שְׁבַע וְשִׁבְעִים *seventy and seven*,

mediate apposition: שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר *twelve;* שְׁמֹנַת עָשָׂר *eighteen*, definite construction.

3d, In many cases, when the numeral is in apposition, it is to be taken as an ordinal: e. g. אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה *the fortieth year*, Deut. i. 3; i. e. taking it in the order of computation, *the year, forty.*

So Gen. i. 5. יוֹם אֶחָד *day, one*, i. e. the first. See also Exod. xii. 6, Num. xiii. 2, Deut. xv. 9, 1 Kings xvi. 10, 2 Kings viii. 16, xii. 2, Ezek. xxix. 17, Dan. i. 1. 21, vii. 1, ix. 1, xi. 1, &c.

4th, When it is necessary to qualify the thing, &c. numbered by the addition of some attributive, this attributive will be made to agree with it, either in a *formal* or *logical* point of view, at the pleasure of the writer: e. g. in the first case, שְׁמֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אִישׁ נֹשֵׂא אֵפוֹד *eighty and five men, bearing* (sing.) *an ephod*, 1 Sam. xxii. 18.—In the second, חֲמִשִּׁים אִישׁ רָצִים *fifty men running* (pl.), 1 Kings i. 5.

5th, The thing numbered, measured, &c., may also be considered as *specific* (p. 301, note), and to be construed as *absolute* with reference to the preceding noun: as, שְׁלֹשִׁים בָּנִים *thirty, sons;* אֶלֶף כֶּסֶף *a thousand* (of) *silver*, &c. We, nevertheless, have occasionally the state of construction: as, שְׁתֵּי־לֶחֶם *two* (pieces, &c. of) *bread*, 1 Sam. x. 4, &c.: as, מְאַת שָׁנָה (Art. 238. 4.).

6th, From the facility of supplying certain names of weight and measure on account of their frequent occurrence, they are often omitted by the ellipsis: e. g. וַיִּשְׁקְלוּ אֶת־שְׂכָרִי שְׁלֹשִׁים כָּסֶף *so they weigh for my price thirty* (shekels of) *silver*, Zech. xi. 12; וַיָּמָד שֵׁשׁ־שְׂעֹרִים *so he measures six* (measures of) *barley*, Ruth iii. 15. 17; בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ *in the first* (day) *of the month*, Deut. i. 3; וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֶת־הַפֶּסַח בָּרִאשׁוֹן *and they keep the passover in the first* (month), Num. ix. 5; בָּרִאשׁוֹן בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ

in the first (month) *in the first* (day) *of the month,* Ezek. xxix. 17.

See also Gen. xx. 16, xlv. 22, Lev. xxiii. 17, 1 Sam. x. 4, Ezek. xlv. 21. And, where some of these ellipses are supplied, Gen. xxiii. 15, Lev. xxvii. 3. 6, Ruth ii. 17, &c.

LECTURE XVI.

ON THE COMPLEMENTS OF WORDS GENERALLY, AND OF VERBS IN PARTICULAR.

240. It will perhaps be readily granted, that the character of the words necessary to complete any sentence must very much depend on the signification of the preceding ones; or, which is the same thing, on the signification intended to be conveyed in them by the Writer. I may say, for example, *I am now riding, equitans ego;* or, am *a riding*. But it may also be necessary to state whether this be on a horse, in a carriage, &c. as also to, or from, what place I am thus proceeding; or, for what purpose, &c. The same will hold good of all attributives. A man may be said to be *swift* generally, or swift on foot, swift in the chase, in the pursuit of an enemy, to revenge, to do good or evil, or a thousand other things, which it may be necessary for a Writer or Speaker to state.*

2d, Now, all verbs are necessarily attributive in signification; and, from what we have seen, as to their etymology, there is strong reason to suspect, that they are composed of nothing more than nouns, put in a state of conjugation or combination with one or other of the pronouns. If then, attributive nouns will necessarily stand in need of such complementary words

---

* So in Is. xiii. 19, and Amos iv. 11, we have מַחְפֶּכֶת construed as a verb; and, in Infinitives and Participial nouns this is done regularly.

in order to complete, or modify, the sentences in which they are found, the same must necessarily be true of the same words, when found in the form of verbs. We shall take it for granted, that this is the case. Usually, however, this has been expressed by saying, that nouns derived from verbs are subject to the same mode of construction with the verbs from which they descend. I prefer the contrary method of stating this question; because I can see why nouns as such, require this kind of construction: of verbs we know nothing, on the other supposition. I think, therefore, that this method is both the most natural, and the most easy to be understood: and, as I find constructions which can be understood on no other principle, I have been induced to prefer it.

3d, We have seen, that nouns substantive or attributive may be qualified, &c. by the addition of other words, either in a state of *apposition*, or of *definite* construction, *immediate*, or *mediate*, just as the signification of such word shall require, or, as the intention of the Writer or Speaker may be. The same is the case with verbs, whether *active*, *passive*, *transitive*, *intransitive*, or *neuter*.

4th, In treating of the complements or qualifying words of substantives and attributives, we adopted the terms *Immediate* and *Mediate* as best calculated for our purpose on that occasion. We shall use the same now; because, we believe this to be sufficiently easy and intelligible; and, because it may be interesting to find the same principles prevailing throughout every part of this Language.

5th, But it will be necessary to make another distinction here. The influence of any noun or verb may extend to one or more subsequent words with some vari-

ation of the sense in each; e. g. I may say, "I am riding a horse." Here I would term the influence of the verb *riding, Simple,* because it affects one object only, which is here "a horse." But, if I say, "I am riding a horse towards the city at full speed," then I should term the influence of the verb *Various,* because various subsequent terms are affected by it. I prefer this method of considering the influence of verbs, &c., because the Latin cases of nominative, genitive, accusative, &c., as taken by Schrœderus and others, seem to me ill calculated to convey just notions on this subject; and, because I believe these distinctions to be perfectly foreign to this language. The truth is, the qualifying words added here, as in the rules already given, are nothing more than restricting terms, added for the purpose of defining, &c. the signification of such verb: and, they may be resolved by recurring to one or other of those rules.

241. Generally, having determined whether the signification of any verb or verbal noun, is to be taken *actively* or *passively,** the influence of its action or passion, considered with reference to the subsequent terms either in *immediate* or *mediate* connection with it, will be *Simple* or *Various,* just as the signification of such verb shall require, or, as the intention of the Writer or Speaker may be.—*Examples of active verbs and verbal nouns* in *immediate* connection with a following term, and where the influence is, consequently, *simple;* נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם *let us make,* MAN, Gen. i. 26; זֹרֵעַ זֶרַע *seeding,* or *producing,* SEED, Ib. 29.

---

* We must not always suppose, that because a word has an active or passive form, it must necessarily be so construed. See Storr, p. 200, &c.—It will immediately be seen, that this is nothing more than an inversion of the rule respecting the mutual dependence of words (Art. 230.).

2d, In *mediate* connection: בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם *God created* THE HEAVENS, Gen. i. 1; וַיַּרְא ... אֶת־הָאוֹר *and he saw* THE LIGHT, Ib. 4; וַיַּבְדֵּל ... בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין הַחֹשֶׁךְ *and he divided* BETWEEN THE LIGHT *and* BETWEEN THE DARKNESS, Ib.; וַיִּקְרָא לָאוֹר ... וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא *and he called the* LIGHT .... *and* THE DARKNESS *he called* .... Ib. 5; מַבְדִּיל בֵּין מַיִם (a thing) *dividing* BETWEEN THE WATERS, Ib. 6.

3d, Both in *immediate* and *mediate* connection, or, where the influence is *various:* עֹשֶׂה פְּרִי לְמִינוֹ (a tree) *producing* FRUIT, ACCORDING TO ITS KIND, Gen. i. 11; מַזְרִיעַ זֶרַע לְמִינֵהוּ (herb) *producing* SEED AFTER *its* KIND, Ib. 12.

The verb הָיָה construed with ל will signify either *to have*, or *to become*, according to the context: e. g. לְעָשִׁיר הָיָה צֹאן *the rich man had flocks*, 2 Sam. xii. 2; וְהָיוּ לְדָם *so they shall become blood*, i. e. *the waters*, Exod. iv. 9.

4th, Where the connection is *mediate*, and the influence *various:* וְהָיוּ לִמְאוֹרֹת בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהָאִיר עַל־הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי־כֵן: *and they shall be* FOR LIGHTS IN *the* FIRMAMENT *of the heavens*, FOR *giving light* UPON THE EARTH, *and it was so*, Gen. i. 15; וַיִּתֵּן אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהָאִיר עַל־הָאָרֶץ: וְלִמְשֹׁל בַּיּוֹם וּבַלַּיְלָה וּלְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין הַחֹשֶׁךְ וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: *and God placed* THEM IN THE FIRMAMENT *of the heavens* FOR GIVING LIGHT UPON THE EARTH, *and* FOR RULING OVER THE DAY *and* OVER THE NIGHT, *and* FOR DIVIDING BETWEEN THE LIGHT *and* BETWEEN THE DARKNESS. *And God saw* THAT (it was) GOOD, Ib. 17, 18.

5th, So, in causative, and other doubly transitive verbs, the influence will be necessarily *various:* e. g. וְהַלַכְתִּיהָ הַמִּדְבָּר *and I caused* HER *to walk* THE DESERT, Hos. ii. 6; מוֹשִׁיב יְחִידִים בַּיְתָה *who causes* THE SOLITARY *ones to possess* A HOUSE, Ps. lxviii. 7.

6th, In these cases, though the objects are more than one, the connection is *immediate,* which is rare: in the following, both *immediate* and *mediate:* e. g. .... וַיָּשֶׁב אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּבָר *and he caused* WORD *to be returned* TO THE KING, 1 Kings ii. 30; לִמַּד דַּעַת אֶת־הָעָם *he taught* KNOWLEDGE TO THE PEOPLE, Eccl. xii. 9; וַשְׁמִיעוּ דְבָרַי *let them cause* MY PEOPLE *to hear* MY WORDS, Jer. xxiii. 22.

7th, In these the connection is miscellaneous, and some of the verbs passive: וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִקָּווּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל־מָקוֹם אֶחָד וְתֵרָאֶה הַיַּבָּשָׁה וַיְהִי־כֵן: *and God said, Let the waters be gathered* FROM BENEATH *the heavens* TO *one place, and let the dry land appear, and it was so,* Gen. i. 9; וְהָרְאָה אֶת־הַכֹּהֵן* *then let it be shewn* TO THE PRIEST, Lev. xiii. 49; אֲשֶׁר הָרְאֵתָ בָּהָר *which thou wast shewn* IN THE MOUNT, Exod. xxvi. 30; לֹא תַעֲבְדֵם *thou shalt not cause* THEM *to be worshipped,* Exod. xx. 5, xxiii. 24; יֻתַּן אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לַעֲבָדֶיךָ *let it be given* (i. e.) *this land* TO *thy servants,* Num. xxxii. 5.

See also Gen. xxvii. 42, 2 Sam. xxi. 6, Jer. xxxv. 14, &c.

Observations.

8th, A little consideration will enable any one to see, that the construction must in all cases very much depend on the intention of the Writer. It is true, certain constructions only are allowed; because, they have been generally adopted, and these are to be known only from long and constant practice in the language, or, from the use of the Concordance: but, in general, the principle is in Hebrew, as it is in English: viz. that the significations of words will always be influenced by those with which they are connected. A few remarks on the examples given will make all plain. In the first we have נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם *let us*

---

* The particles mostly used with passive verbs, however, are ל and מ. See Gen. xiv. 19, Is. i. 26. lxii. 4, Ezek. xiv. 3, Neh. vi. 1, 1 Chron. v. 20, &c.

make man. Here, the word *man* may be said to be in *immediate* connection with the preceding word, and to qualify or restrict its signification, just as שָׁנָה *year* does the word אַרְבָּעִים *forty*, in the phrase אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה *forty year* (Art. 239. 3.); or, as the English word *year* does the word *forty*, in the same example; *absolutely*, as it regards the grammatical construction, and, therefore, just as the تمييز i. e. the *specific* construction does in the Arabic (see p. 301, note). This would be exemplified in that language, by what is termed a juxta-position, النصب, or المفعول بِهِ, thus: انسانا نصنع, or لنصنع, which is, in reality, nothing more than تمييز, i. e. *specification*, with reference to the signification of the verb. The next example (Art. 241.) is perfectly parallel to the Arabic: حسن وجهة, or حسن وجها *handsome* (of) *face.* See p. 320. note.

9th, The next instance (Ib. n. 2.), is one which has been termed *mediate* connection, that is, where we have the particle אֵת falling between the verb and its complementary or restricting word, apparently for the purpose of shewing, that the following, not the preceding, word is to be construed as complementary to the signification of the verb. Kimchi has remarked long ago (see Art. 179. 11. note), that such is the office of this particle. His illustration is the phrase, *Judah killed Simeon* הָרַג יְהוּדָה אֶת שִׁמְעוֹן, where he says, that the particle being omitted, it could not be known which is the subjective, or which the objective, case to the verb. This would undoubtedly be the case in this and all similar passages; and I believe, this is one of the offices of this, and perhaps of all the other particles, so situated, though this is certainly not all. The other particles have, likewise, the force of defining the relation, which the action of the verb has, with reference to that word or words, which designate its object either directly or indirectly: e. g. הָלַךְ construed with אֶל will signify, *he walked towards*; with מִ or מִן *from*; with לִפְנֵי *before*; with אַחַר or אַחֲרֵי *after*, and so on: and even אֵת, as Schrœderus has remarked, always requires, that the word following it be definite in signification.* Situated, then, as this and other particles are, in *mediate* connection

* Synt. R. 31.

with verbs, they may be considered as occasionally pointing out the objective, or, perhaps, some oblique, case of the noun immediately affected by them: and hence it is that the particle אֵת has been said to mark the objective case in active, and the nominative (which is really the objective case) in passive, verbs.*

10th, This particle, however, is often found without any preceding verb; and, in those cases, seems manifestly intended to impress upon the mind the force of the word immediately following it, as being of considerable importance. Of this character is the following passage, to which many more might be added: אֶת־עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן לֹא־סָר AS TO *the pillar of the cloud, it passed not away*, Neh. ix. 19. The verb following is manifestly not passive, אֵת, therefore, does not here point out the objective case: on the contrary, it is found in apposition with the nominative of a verb in the active voice; and apparently for the purpose of impressing that word on the reader's mind, as being important. I find that in most cases, *as to, with reference to*, or the like, will give a translation, perhaps, exactly suiting its import: and, if I am not greatly mistaken, will hold in all others: e. g. בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם *God created* (I speak) WITH REFERENCE *to the heavens*, &c. So יִתְהַלֵּךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים *he walked about*, i. e. *daily exercised himself* (I say) WITH REFERENCE *to God*, Gen. v. 22; וַיֵּצֵא אֶת־הָעִיר *and he went out* (i. e.) WITH RESPECT *to the city*,† Exod. ix. 33. That

---

* The Bengáli particle *Kē* is used in a similar way, as is also the Persian را. See Professor Haughton's Bengáli Gram. Artt. 90. 91. 92.

† Schrœderus has endeavoured to explain this sort of construction, by having recourse to a metonymy, by which he says, intransitive verbs take the signification and construction of transitive ones (Synt. R. 69.). For my part, I can see no necessity for this; nor, for introducing the doctrine about nominative, accusative, or other, cases, in conformity with the usage of the Latin and Greek grammars, which has really been the cause why Schrœderus has been driven to this expedient. In Hebrew we have no cases. Why then should we talk about that which has no existence, and then coin rule after rule in order to conform ourselves to notions thus groundless? If then we can conceive these particles to have the same defining character that they have when coming between nouns in construction or apposition (see Art. 236), we shall have no difficulty in perceiving why they are sometimes omitted, or used the one for the other: e. g. וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן *so they enter the land of Canaan*, Gen. xlv. 25, for אֶל אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן *into the land of Canaan*; שָׁבָה הָעִיר *return* (to) *the city*, for אֶל הָעִיר *to the city*, 2 Sam. xv. 27; יַעֲלוּ שָׁמַיִם יֵרְדוּ

is, generally, the person or thing recommended to the attention of the reader, as being the object influenced by some important word in the context, may, whether it be in the situation of a nominative or objective case, be pointed out by the particle אֵת being put before it.

11th, In the eighth example (n. 3.) we have both the *immediate* and *mediate* connection of a verb or verbal noun with its complementary words. And here, it will be immediately seen, that had not the particle ל been introduced before the last, some ambiguity might have arisen, as to the precise sense in which it ought to be taken: or, in other words, as to the precise relation of the latter, to the two former, words. The same has been remarked of words in the state of *mediate apposition* and *construction*. The principle in each case is one and the same.

12th, With respect to the causative verbs, if we suppose them to be actually composed of two words; which, according to our system, is always the case with *Hiphḥíl* and *Hophḥál*, we shall readily perceive why two complementary, or restricting, words would be necessary to complete the idea contained in each of them. This is what Grammarians usually term, a double accusative: and these verbs, doubly transitive. It is curious enough to remark, that when these verbs become passive, the object of one of them will stand as its nominative, that of the other as the accusative: for this obvious reason, viz. that, in this case, one of the verbs only, in the compound takes the passive character, the other remains active: e. g. Lev. xiii. 49, as above, *Fac eam* videri à sacerdote. This is still more evident in the Arabic where we have terminations marking these cases: e. g. active, أطعمت ابنك لحما *I caused thy son to eat flesh*; passive, أطعم ابنك لحما

תְּהוֹמוֹת *they ascend the heavens, they descend the deep*, Ps. cvii. 26. In all which cases, the latter word in the construction may be considered as being merely *specific*, as in the case of nouns of number, weight, measure, &c. In other instances the particles sometimes vary: as, יָרֵא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ 1 Kings i. 51; יָרֵא מִפְּנֵי שְׁלֹמֹה *he feared the king—he feared from before Solomon*, Ib. 50. And Ps. lv. 20, יָרְאוּ אֱלֹהִים *they fear God*, without a particle. So, with יָצָא, יָצָא הָעִיר *he went out* (into) *the city*, 2 Kings xx. 4; יָצָא אֶל־ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ *he went out to the altar*, Lev. xvi. 18; יָצְאָה מֵחֶשְׁבּוֹן Num. xxi. 28 יָצְאָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה Num. xvi. 35; יָצָא מִלְּפָנֵי יְהוָה Ib. xvii. 11. With מִפְּנֵי Est. vii. 8, compare viii. 15; יָצְאוּ אֶת־הָעִיר Gen. xliv. 4, &c.

thy son was caused to eat bread. See M. de Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. ii. p. 101. In the other species, viz. *Pīḥél*, and *Pūḥál*, the accessory idea may be considered as being equivalent to an additional word.

13th, Of the other examples nothing need be said; the variety of the particles introduced is such as the various relations of the words to each other seems to require, for the purpose of presenting to the mind of the reader the various circumstances, which the writer wished to detail; but without these, all must have been error and confusion.

14th, It has been said, that practice and the Concordance must be relied on, as to the use and signification of these particles, and in order to know, what verbs are construed with or without them. Some general rules, however, have been given on this subject; but, as they cannot be entirely relied upon, we may be excused if we omit them altogether.

The question relating to the omission, &c. of the particles, is one of so much importance, and generally so little understood, that I shall, perhaps, be excused if I cite a paragraph from Storr on it; Sect. lxxiii. 11:—'*Præpositiones* sæpe omitti videntur, ubi *accusativum* potius intelligere aportet; ut Hos. ii. 17. in verbis בְּיוֹם, בִּימֵי non defit *Beth*, sed tempus indicatur *accusativo*, quemadmodum apud Arabes (p. 267. s.) (Art. 232.), Es. xxviii. 21, כְּהַר valet quidem: sicut *in* monte, sed *accusativus* apud Hebræos eam vim habet (p. 321. s.), Jer. xxxii. 24, "aggeres venerunt *ad* urbem;" proprie est: Venerunt *urbem*. Nam ante suffixum in תְּבוֹאֵנִי (veniat ad me), Ps. xxxvi. 12, certe non omissa est præpositio, sed *accusativus* agnosci debet (add. p. 272. ss.), 1 Sam. xxi. 2; sensus quidem est: ne quis resciscat aliquid *de* negotio, cujus *caussa* (אֲשֶׁר) mitto te, sed אֲשֶׁר proprie accusativus est, valens (p. 270. ss.) *cujus ratione habita*, quemadmodum præcedens, אֶת־הַדָּבָר significat *quod attinet ad negotium*. Sic 2 Sam. xi. 22: "indicavit Davidi totam rem, *cujus caussa* miserat eum, vel: quam in mandatis ei dederat, Joabus," (add. Exod. iv. 28.).

15th, What has been here said of verbs is true of all verbal nouns, whether of the Infinitive or Participial kind; i. e. the complementary or defining word may be put, either in the state of apposition *mediate* or *immediate*, or in that of *definite* construction. The former cases have been sufficiently exemplified; the following are a few instances of the latter. Of Infinitives, בִּימֵי שְׁפֹט הַשֹּׁפְטִים *in the days of the judges' judging*, Ruth i. 1; מִדֵּי דַבְּרִי בוֹ *from the abundance of my speaking against*

him, Jer. xxxi. 20; שְׁמֹר מִצְוֹתָיו *the keeping of his statutes*, Deut. viii. 11; עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט וְאַהֲבַת חֶסֶד *the doing of judgment, and the loving of piety*, Mic. vi. 8. Of Participles, מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי *seekers of my soul*, וְדֹרְשֵׁי רָעָתִי *and followers out of my evil*, Ps. xxxviii. 13; נֹשְׂאֵי מָגֵן וְדֹרְכֵי קָשֶׁת *carriers of a shield, and treaders of the bow*, 2 Chron. xiv. 7; מְשִׁיבַת נָפֶשׁ *a restorer of the soul*, מַחְכִּימַת פֶּתִי *an instructor of the simple*, מְשַׂמְּחֵי לֵב *delighters of the heart*, &c., Ps. xix. 8, 9. See also Gen. ix. 10, xxiii. 10, xxxi. 16, 2 Sam. v. 8, Is. xxxviii. 18, liii. 4, Lam. i. 4, Joel i. 8, Ps. xxxviii. 6, Cant. ii. 5, &c. With pronouns, Ps. xxxvii. 2, Prov. ii. 9, ix. 18, &c.

242. Having thus far stated and exemplified the general law relating to the complementary or restrictive words attendant on verbs, we may now proceed to notice a few particular instances, which may otherwise give some trouble to the Learner.

On apparently Elliptical Constructions.

2d, The nature of some active,* neuter, and of all passive verbs, being such as to include within themselves the word expressive of their object, complement, or other restriction, will not stand in need of any other for that purpose, when their influence is *simple:* but, when it is *various,* the connexion will be either *immediate* or *mediate,* as before. In the one case, the connection may be said to be *Implicit,* in others, *Explicit.* N. B. This has been usually termed by the Grammarians, "Constructio prægnans." Examples: לֹא רִבִּיתָ *thou hast not made usury,* or *gain,* Ps. xliv. 13.

This is an instance where the influence may be said to be *simple*

---

* These are for the most part verbs of the *Pi*ḥ*él* and *Hiphḥíl* species, which have been formed from substantive nouns, Art. 162. 8. 165. 5, &c. See Glass. Philol. Ed. Dathe, pp. 185—254, &c. Storr, p. 15, &c. For similar instances in the Arabic, see Mr. de Sacy's Gram. vol. ii. Art. 653—657.

and *implicit*; but, when we add בִּמְחִירֵיהֶם *by their price*, it is *various*, and necessarily *explicit*, and we have the particle ב introduced for the purpose of pointing that out. So בַּל־שֹׁרֵשׁ בָּאָרֶץ *it hath not struck root into the earth*, Is. xl. 24. See Jer. x. 18, Josh. xxiv. 20, &c. So הִתַּהֲרוּ *cleanse yourselves*, or rather, *become ye clean*, Gen. xxxv. 2. See also Ib. xxv. 22.

3d, Of this character are the following examples, which have usually been considered as being impersonal: חָרָה לוֹ *he became hot to himself* (or, *heat became hot to him*), Ps. xviii. 8; אַל־יִחַר בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנָי *let it not become hot*, (i. e. let not heat exist) *in the eyes of my Lord*, Gen. xxxi. 35; אַל יֵרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ *let not evil be in thy eyes*, Ib. xxi. 12; וַתֵּצַר לְדָוִד *and* (pressure) *pressed upon David*, 1 Sam. xxx. 6; לֹא תַמְטִיר עָלֶיהָ* (rain) *rains not upon it*, Amos iv. 7.

4th, So with passive verbs and participles: as, וְאָמְרוּ נוֹאַשׁ *so they said, it has become desperate*, Jer. xviii. 12, i. e. אֹמֶר נוֹאָשׁ, or דָּבָר הוּא THE MATTER *has become desperate*; נִשְׂעֲרָה מְאֹד *it became very tempestuous*, Ps. l. 3, i. e. *the tempest* שְׂעָרָה *became so*; אֲשֶׁר עֻבַּד בָּךְ *which has been imposed as slavery upon thee*, Isa. xiv. 3, i. e. הָעֲבוֹדָה *the slavery mentioned just before*; אֲשֶׁר יֻלַּד לוֹ *which had been caused to be born to him*, Gen. xxxv. 26, i. e. the sons mentioned just before; שֶׁיְּדֻבַּר בָּהּ *in which it shall be spoken respecting her*, Cant. viii. 8, i. e. דָּבָר *a word*.

See also Gen. iv. 26, x. 25, xlvi. 22, Is. xxiii. 1, Lam. v. 5, Job xxx. 15. And with participles, Is. xxvi. 3, Ps. lxxxvii. 3.

5th, Hence it is, that in many instances the word necessary to complete, or qualify the sense of the verb,

---

* This would universally be so supplied in the Persian بَارَان نَه بَارَانِيدَه اَسْت بَرآن.

is frequently omitted by the ellipsis: e. g. לֹא יָלְדָה לוֹ *she had not borne to him*, i. e. *a son*, Gen. xvi. 1; וַיִּשְׁלַח *so he sent*, i. e. *a messenger*, Ib. xli. 14; יִצְבֹּר *he accumulated*, i. e. *wealth*, Ps. xxxix. 7.

See also Ps. lxxvi. 12, 1 Sam. viii. 15, &c. The same often takes place in phrases of common occurrence: as, יִכְרֹת *he cut*, or *made*, i. e. *a covenant*, בְּרִית 1 Sam. xx. 16; לֹא וַיִּפְרְסוּ *they broke not*, i. e. לֶחֶם *bread*, Jer. xvi. 7; הִפִּילוּ *they cast*, i. e. גּוֹרָל *the lot*, 1 Sam. xiv. 42.

6th, Under this head may be arranged the apparently frequent ellipses of the antecedent to the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר The reason seems to be this: viz. אֲשֶׁר ought to be considered, not as being a mere adjective signifying *qui, quæ, quod*, &c. but, *is qui, ea quæ, id quod*,* &c. including a substantive, like other attributes. Hence, in such cases there is no real ellipsis: e. g. יִשָּׂאֲךָ עַל־אֲשֶׁר לֹא־אָדָע *he will take thee up to* (a place) *which I know not*, 1 Kings xviii. 12; וְשָׁתִית מֵאֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאֲבוּן הַנְּעָרִים *and thou shalt drink out of* THAT WHICH *the young men draw*, Ruth ii. 9; בַּאֲשֶׁר תָּמוּתִי אָמוּת *in* (THE PLACE in) WHICH *thou diest, I will die*, Ruth i. 17.

7th, This relative pronoun (אֲשֶׁר) must be considered, moreover, as being *definite* in its signification, like other pronouns: and, consequently, not necessary to be expressed when the antecedent is indefinite: e. g. בְּיוֹם דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה *on a day* (on which) *Jehovah spoke to Moses*, Exod. vi. 28; אַשְׁרֵי־אָדָם לֹא יַחְשֹׁב יְהוָה לוֹ עָוֹן *blessed is* ANY MAN, *Jehovah imputes not to him iniquity*, i. e. *to whom*, &c. Ps. xxxii. 2, comp. Ps. i. 1.

---

* See Noldius sub voce, p. 98, note *d*. It is also a remark of Noldius, "Præpositio semper pronominis relativi, ad quod se refert, objectum supponit, atque in quod ipsa inflecit; sive id exprimendum concipiatur per nomen, sive per pronomen antecedens מי vel מה," &c. See also his note under בַּאֲשֶׁר. Concord. Part. Ed. 1734.

8th, There are, however, some instances in which this rule seems to be contravened: e. g. אֲנִי הַגֶּבֶר רָאָה עָנִי *I am* THE *man* (who) *has seen affliction*, Lam. iii. 1; יִזְבְּחוּ לַשֵּׁדִים לֹא אֱלוֹהַּ *they sacrificed to the devils* (who are) *not God*, &c. Deut. xxxii. 17. But in these cases, the article does not refer so much to the *definite* character of the noun, as to its *properties*, i. e. I am *that sort* of man, &c. See Art. 233. 11.

9th, In the following examples, some consequence seems to be intimated by the influence of words termed *prægnantia*, which may, therefore, be supplied by the ellipsis: וַיַּגֶּד מֹשֶׁה לְאַהֲרֹן אֵת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחוֹ *and Moses relates to Aaron all the words of Jehovah, which he had sent him*, (i. e. to relate) Exod. iv. 28; see also the remainder of the verse; וּפָחֲדוּ אֶל־יְהוָה *and they shall fear towards Jehovah*, i. e. *fearing shall turn to Jehovah*, Hos. iii. 5; לְקָרָאתוֹ .... וַיֶּחֶרְדוּ *and they fear meeting him*, i. e. *they fearing proceed to meet him*, 1 Sam. xvi. 4; לָאָרֶץ חִלְּלוּ מִשְׁכַּן שְׁמֶךָ *to the earth have they profaned the habitation of thy name*, i. e. *profaned and cast it down to the earth*, Ps. lxxiv. 7.

See also Gen. xii. 15, Exod. xxvii. 20, xxxiv. 15, Lev. iv. 2, Numb. xix. 2, Deut. i. 36, xxv. 18, 1 Sam. x. 9, xxiii. 7, xxiv. 6, 2 Sam. xviii. 19. 31, xix. 9. 12, 2 Kings v. 3. 6, Ps. xxii. 22, xxviii. 1, lv. 19, lxvi. 15, lxxiii. 27, lxxxix. 40, cxviii. 5, Is. vii. 6, xxi. 9, Jer. iii. 20, xli. 7, Hos. i. 2, iv. 12, Job vi. 14, Ezra ii. 62, 2 Chron. xxxii. 1, &c.

10th, On this principle it is, that words, the same or similar with those preceding, when apparently necessary for completing the sense of a sentence, are often omitted: e. g. הַט־לִבִּי אֶל־עֵדְוֹתֶיךָ וְאַל אֶל־בָּצַע INCLINE MY HEART *to thy statutes, and not to gain*, Ps. cxix. 36; וְכָל־הָעָם רֹאִים אֶת־הַקּוֹלוֹת וְאֶת־הַלַּפִּידִם וְאֵת קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר *and the whole of the people* SAW *the thunderings and the lightnings, and the sound of the trumpet*, &c. Exod. xx. 18.

See also Deut. iv. 12, xxxii. 13, Job x. 12, Est. iv. 1. And in the New Testament, 1 Cor. iii. 2, 1 Tim. iv. 3, James i. 9, 10. Hence, also, the word *hear*, &c. has often the signification of *understanding*,

obeying, or the like. Comp. Acts ix. 7, with xxii. 9: and, generally, verbs of sense are used the one for the other.

11th, Hence, also, verbs, nouns, or particles, which may be supplied from some part of the context, or which are necessary to it, are often omitted by the ellipsis: e. g. of verbs: שִׁמְרוּ־מִי בַנַּעַר בְּאַבְשָׁלוֹם *observe ye who* (whoever of you CONCERNING) *the young man Absalom*, 2 Sam. xviii. 12; אִישׁ אֶל־עִירוֹ וְאִישׁ אֶל־אַרְצוֹ (let) *each man* (GO) *to his city, and each man to his land*, 1 Kings xxii. 36.

So Ps. xxv. 15, xxxiii. 18, xxxiv. 16, Prov. vi. 26, Is. lxvi. 6, Hos. viii. 1, &c. And particularly of לֵאמֹר *saying*, e. g. יְתְבּוֹנָנוּ לֵאמֹר (לֵאמֹר) הֲזֶה הָאִישׁ *they consider* (saying), *Is this the man?* Is. xiv. 16, ib. 8, &c. which is perhaps owing to the direct and abrupt manner in which citations are generally made by the Hebrews. See Art. 244. 13.

12th, This often happens also with the noun, which is the *apparent* nominative, and sometimes when it must be supplied from different parts of the same context: e. g. לָמָּה יִתֵּן לְעָמֵל אוֹר *why giveth he* (GOD) *light to the sorrowful*, Job iii. 20; שָׁאַל וַיָּבֵא שְׂלָו *he asked* (i. e. THE PEOPLE) *and he* (GOD) *brought the quails*, Ps. cv. 40; וַיִּקְרָא־לוֹ דָוִד וַיֹּאכַל לְפָנָיו וַיֵּשְׁתְּ וַיְשַׂכְּרֵהוּ וַיֵּצֵא בָעֶרֶב וַיִּצֵא *and David called him* (URIAH), *and he* (URIAH) *ate before him* (i. e. DAVID), *and drank, and he* (DAVID) *made him drunken, and he* (URIAH) *went out in the evening*, 2 Sam. xi. 13.

13th, The most frequent ellipsis is of the negatives, לֹא לָנֶצַח יִשָּׁכַח אֶבְיוֹן תִּקְוַת עֲנָוִים לֹא, אַיִן, אַל, &c.: e. g. תֹּאבַד לָעַד: *the poor* (man) *shall not be forgotten for ever*, (NOR) *shall the expectation of the humble* (ones) *for ever perish*, Ps. ix. 19.

See Deut. xxxiii. 6, 1 Sam. ii. 3, Ps. xliv. 19, Prov. xxv. 27, xxx. 3, Is. xxxviii. 18, xli. 28, &c. Of פֶּן *lest*, Exod. xix. 22, Is. vi. 10; לָמָּה *why?* Ps. ii. 1, 2, x. 1; כַּמָּה *how often?* Job xxi. 17,

18, 19, 20; אֵיךְ *how?* Ps. lxxiii. 19; אֵיכָה *Id.* Lam. i. 1, 2, 3, 4, ii. 1. 2, iv. 1. 4. 8. 10; מַה *what?* Joel i. 18; עַד־מָה *how long?* Ps. iv. 3, lxxxix. 47; עַד־מָתַי *how long?* Ps. xciv. 4, 5, 6, &c. For an ample consideration of this subject, see Glassius's Philologia Sacra, Edit. Dathe, vol. i. p. 608, &c.

It has not been deemed necessary to enter at length into the consideration of the government of verbs when followed by the personal pronouns; or, of that of Infinitives or verbal nouns, &c. The view which has been taken of the subject makes it unnecessary to enter into any such discussion; the nature of the case requiring, that the construction be analogous in every instance.

LECTURE XVII.

ON THE MODES AND TENSES OF THE VERBS.

243. Having considered the construction of the Hebrew verbs, we now proceed to discuss the doctrine of their tenses.

2d, As the Hebrew Language recognizes no variation of termination in verbs, indicative of mode, no place has been assigned to that distinction in the paradigms: nor will it be necessary to enter on that consideration, until we have considered the doctrine of the tenses: but, when this is done, we shall offer a few remarks on that subject.

Of the Tenses.

244. In our theory of the verb we have proceeded upon the supposition, that the *Preterite tense* is formed on a Concrete noun as its basis;—the *Present* on an Abstract.

2d, If, then, the basis of the Preterite be a Concrete noun, such word considered alone, will necessarily refer to some past time, for the commencement of the action, passion, state, &c. meant by the root; and which, when put into a state of conjugation, might be considered as intimating some indefinite past tense. If, for example, I say in Latin, *Amans ego,* or *Amatus ego,* the meaning must be, that at some time antecedent to the present, I began to be, and consequently am, either the subject, or object, of the action intimated by the verb *amo:* but,

whether I shall be found to be so hereafter, must be determined by some word, or words, added for that purpose.

3d, Accordingly we find, in Hebrew, that our Preterite tense universally refers to past time, unless some of the circumstances hereafter to be detailed, shall require the contrary.

4th, Again, if the *Present tense* be formed on an Abstract noun, as no intimation whatever can be given, by this combination, of any person or thing being at any time past or future subject to the influence of such word, the sense to be thus supplied will naturally apply to the present time, unless indeed some of the circumstances hereafter to be detailed suggest the contrary.

5th, But here an important question will arise, which is this: How are we to determine the period from which we are to reckon, when speaking of past, present, or future, tenses? This, I believe, involves the principal part of the question before us: and, unless we can shew in what respects the Oriental writers differ from our own on this point, we shall never be able to account for the construction of any considerable part of the context found in any book written in the Hebrew or any of its Dialects: but, if we can do this satisfactorily, I think we shall be able to solve a problem, which has hitherto baffled the skill of every European Writer.

6th, In the first place then, if we suppose any writer to be commencing a narrative, he must necessarily speak of past, present, or future time, with reference to the period at which his statement is made: and, to this period it will be in his power to recur, whenever it may suit his purpose to do so. This use of the tenses may therefore be termed *Absolute*.

7th, In the next place, a writer may speak of past,

present, or future events, with reference to some other period or event already introduced into the context. This may be termed the *Relative* use of the tenses.

8th, In the Hebrew paradigm, we have only two tenses, viz. a *Past*, and a *Present*, tense. To the present tense, the *Participles** and *Infinitives* are nearly allied. That is, either of these when unrestricted by any other considerations, are generally to be understood as referring to the present time, either *absolute* or *relative*. Besides, in every case, both these tenses, together with the Participles, &c. may also become *relative* in their application; i. e. they may be considered as speaking of a time either past, present, or future, with reference to some other period or event already introduced to the reader's notice. Hence a Preterite connected with another Preterite, may be equivalent to our pluperfect; a Present following a preterite, to our imperfect; and so on, affording every distinction of time necessary for the purpose of language. Of these examples will now be given, beginning with those which have been termed *absolute*.

9th, Generally, in the commencement of narrations, paragraphs, &c. the use of the tenses will be *absolute*, as in English: e. g. בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים *in the beginning God* CREATED, Gen. i. 1; וְהָאָדָם יָדַע אֶת־חַוָּה *and* (as to) *the man he* KNEW *Eve his wife*, Ib. iv. 1.

See also Gen. iii. 11, 12, 13. 16, 17, Is. i. 1, ii. 1, &c.

10th, When it is necessary to enounce any thing in

---

* Participial nouns may, indeed, have been used as preterites, for the reasons just given respecting concrete nouns: but, in practice, they include within themselves no particular tense, and are, very much like the present, to be construed either in the past, present, or future, tense, as the context may require: and may in almost every case be substituted for the present.

the *absolute* present tense,* either our present tense, or one of the participles may be used: e. g. לָמָּה לִי

---

* See also Is. v. 23, vi. 2, vii. 14. In this last instance, I understand יִתֵּן *he gives*, to refer to the declaration or prediction of the Prophet, which is here termed אוֹת *sign*, or *wonder*. See Gen. iv. 15, Exod. iii. 12, iv. 8. 28, 1 Sam. ii. 34, 2 Kings xix. 29, where it seems to mean a *prediction*, not a visible sign.—That, which has been termed an Aorist, by the Writers on Arabic Grammar, is *really* the present tense, as will appear from the following considerations. In a Commentary on the Káfia كافية of Ibn ul Hájib, by Najm Oddeen of Irák, preserved among Mr. Burckhardt's books in the Public Library at Cambridge, it is said of this tense, وقال بعضهم هو حقيقة في الحال مجاز في الاستقبال وهو اقوي لانّه اذا خلي من القرائن لم يحمل الا علي الحال ولا ينصرف الي الاستقبال الا لقرينةٍ وهذا شان الحقيقة والمجاز i. e. "Some say, that it is *absolutely* a *present tense*, but *allowed* to be used as *a future*, which is the best opinion. For, when it is accompanied by no other (words, &c.) it can refer to the *present tense* only: nor is it used as a future, except when so accompanied. This is what we mean by *absolute*, and *allowable*." See also the following examples; مَا يُزَكِّي الانسَانَ بِشَهَادَةِ اَهْلِ بَيْتِهِ *a man* IS NOT JUSTIFIED *by the testimony of his own family*; مَا يَوَدُّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا اَن يُنَزَّلَ عَلَيكُم مِن خَيرٍ مِن رَبِّكُم *those who have not believed* DO NOT LIKE, *that any good thing* SHOULD BE SENT *down to you from your Lord*. M. de Sacy, Arab. Gram. vol. i. p. 132.

Again, they consider the *present tense* as being of two kinds; one they term *the real present*; اَلْحَالُ تَحْقِيقًا, by which they mean, the tense which we have termed *absolute*; or, in other words, in which a person commits to writing any event or number of events he may have to detail. This is what our Grammarians always understand by *The Present tense*. The other is that which is termed اَلْحَالُ حِكَايَةً, i. e. *the present, as to narration*; by which they mean, the time contemporary with any event, and which may, therefore, be considered as being *present* with it, although *past*, *present*, or *future*, with regard to the *real* or *absolute present tense*. The following passages taken from the Commentary on the Káfia by Moolla Jámi will be sufficient to shew in

רֹב־זִבְחֵיכֶם יֹאמַר יְהוָה *what* (is) *the multitude of your sacrifices to me?* SAITH *Jehovah,* Is. i. 11; לְכוּ־נָא וְנִוָּכְחָה יֹאמַר יְהוָה *come now,* LET US REASON *together,* SAITH JEHOVAH, Ib. v. 18; הוֹי מַגִּיעֵי בַיִת בְּבַיִת שָׂדֶה בְשָׂדֶה יַקְרִיבוּ *woe* (to those) WHO JOIN *house to house,* (who) LAY *field to field,* Is. v. 8.

In this last instance the participle holds a place in the parallelism corresponding with the present tense.

כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מְבִיאֲךָ אֶל־אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה אֶרֶץ נַחֲלֵי מָיִם עֲיָנוֹת וּתְהֹמֹת יֹצְאִים בַּבִּקְעָה וּבָהָר׃ *for the Lord thy God*

---

what manner they speak on this subject (p. ٣٧٣-١٤) speaking of the use of the particle حتّي it is said, اذا كان اى المضارع مستقبلاً بالنظر الي ما قبلها وان كان بالنظر الي زمان التكلّم ماضياً اوحالاً او مستقبلاً i. e. *when the* مضارع (i. e. our *present*) *is to be taken as a future, with reference to what may have gone before;* or, *with reference to the time in which the relation was first made,* as A PAST, PRESENT, OR FUTURE. And again, فان اردت بالفعل الذي دخله حتّي الحال يعني زمان الحال تحقيقًا اي بطريق التحقيق بان يكون هي زمان التكلّم بعينه .... او حكايةً اي بطريق الحكاية كما تقول كنت سرت امس حتي ادخل البلد فادخل في هذا الموضع حكاية الحال الماضية فكانك كنت في زمان الدخول هيّأت هذه العبارة وتحكيها في زمان التكلّم علي ما كنت هيّأته i. e. *if you intend by the verb preceded by* حتي *to express the* PRESENT TENSE, i. e. *the time of the* ABSOLUTE PRESENT; *that is to say, by way of verifying it as present with the time of the original narration itself,* &c. .... or, by *way of* (subsequent) حكاية NARRATION, (i. e. relatively) *as if you should say, I was* (so circumstanced that) *I proceeded yesterday, in order that I* (may then) *enter the city.*

Here the word ادخل I ENTER *(is used in) the* NARRATION *of a past circumstance, as though you had expressed yourself in this manner at the* TIME *of entering, relating the circumstance in the relative present in consequence of having so conceived the matter* (in your own mind).

(now) BRINGETH *thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water,* of *fountains and depths that* SPRING *out of the valleys and hills,* Deut. viii. 7.

11th, When, however, any event, hereafter to come to pass, is enounced *prophetically;* or, any circumstances are mentioned, manifestly relating to a future period, either the *present tense,* or one of the *participles* may then also be used: e. g. וְאֶעֶשְׂךָ לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל וַאֲבָרֶכְךָ וַאֲגַדְּלָה שְׁמֶךָ *and* I MAKE *thee a great nation, and* I BLESS *thee, and* MAKE *thy name great,* Gen. xii. 2; אֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לֹא בְמִסְכֵּנֻת תֹּאכַל־בָּהּ לֶחֶם לֹא־תֶחְסַר כֹּל בָּהּ *a land wherein* THOU MAYEST (or SHALT) EAT *bread without scarceness, thou* SHALT (DOST, MAYEST) *not lack any thing in it,* &c. Deut. viii. 9; וַאֲנִי הִנְנִי מֵקִים אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם וְאֶת־זַרְעֲכֶם אַחֲרֵיכֶם *and* (as for) *me, behold me* ESTABLISHING (ABOUT TO ESTABLISH, *or* WILL ESTABLISH) *my covenant with you, and with your seed after you,* Gen. ix. 9.

The reason of this seems to be, that when any thing is predicted, it may now be said either to be doing or done in the mind of him who makes the prediction. This is also the case in Arabic and Persian, and apparently for the same reason. See Mr. Lumsden's Persian Gram. vol. ii. p. 334—7. In the other case, i. e. when it takes a future signification from circumstances, the mind of the writer and reader seem to be translated to the times referred to, and then the narration is necessarily carried on in the present tense.

12th, Hence, in all cases in which any other person is introduced as speaking, or, in which any event, evidently of past occurrence, is mentioned, the tenses will be reckoned from that period, i. e. placing both the writer and reader in the times in which such declaration, prediction, citation, &c. took place. The same will be the case, when the mind is carried forward in any predic-

tion.* Examples: יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲשֶׁר לָקָחַנִי מִבֵּית אָבִי וּמֵאֶרֶץ מוֹלַדְתִּי וַאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר־לִי וַאֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע־לִי לֵאמֹר לְזַרְעֲךָ אֶתֵּן אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת הוּא יִשְׁלַח מַלְאָכוֹ לְפָנֶיךָ *the Lord God of heaven, who* TOOK *me from my father's house, and from the land of my kindred, and who* SPAKE *unto me, and that* SWARE *unto me, saying, Unto thy seed* GIVE *I this land, he* SENDETH *his angel before thee,* Gen. xxiv. 7.

Here we may observe, that the first three verbs, לָקַח, דִּבֶּר, and נִשְׁבַּע, are all in the preterite tense. The first is necessarily so, by the operation of the rule, Art. 244. 9. The two following are so, because connected with the first by the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, which is more consistently termed a conjunction (حرف الصلة) by the Arabs. In the next place, we have a citation, prefaced by לֵאמֹר *saying*. Then we have the present tense, אֶתֵּן *I give*, i. e. *I give now*, which may be taken as a prophetic future (Ib. note, 11.). In the next place, Abraham, having finished the citation, recurs to the period at which he set out; and from this, the present יִשְׁלַח *he sends, he now sends*, or, taken prophetically, *he will send*, is to be reckoned.†

---

* Here the use of the tenses is *relative*: or rather, partly *absolute*, and partly *relative*.

† Of this kind are all those expressions in Arabic, in which the leading verb is found in the preterite tense, and the following ones in the present, or (as the Grammarians have termed it) the *future*: e. g. اِلتَمس شيأ ليأكله فلم يجِد *he sought something that he might* (now) *eat it, but he finds not*; كَانَا يَنْطَحَانِ بِقُرُونِهِمَا *they two were* (so situated) *that they* (now, i. e. in those circumstances) *butt with the horns of them both.* The same principle holds good, when two preterites follow each other without an intervening conjunction: for then, the first will have respect to some time anterior to that from which the writer had set out, the second to one anterior to that of such verb: e. g. وكان خرج إلى خُراسَان *and he was* (so circumstanced that) *he went out* (before that time) *to Khorásán*, i. e. *and he had gone out.*

Corollary. 13th, Hence, it will also follow, that all citations must be made in the words of the first speaker: i. e. it is not said, that God sware and declared, THAT HE WOULD GIVE *the land to Abraham's seed*, &c.: but, in the original terms of the oath, *unto thy seed* DO, or WILL, I GIVE *it*. And also, that preterites and futures more or

---

Mr. de Sacy remarks, that "le verbe كَانَ employé comme auxiliare, influe sur les prétérits خَرَجَ, &c. et les convertit tous en preterits anterieur." Arab. Gram. vol. i. p. 131. The reason of this is, that each of these verbs involves a preterite tense in its own right, and the reader is, by the combination of both, carried back into a time more remote than either alone could express. This the European Grammarians have termed the *Pluperfect tense*.

As the Persian language has for several centuries been cultivated on the principles of the Arabic grammar, it may not be amiss to cite Mr. Lumsden's remarks on this use of the present tense. "In the conversation of the Persians," says he (Pers. Gram. vol. ii. p. 336.), "though seldom perhaps in written composition, the present is often found to supersede the past tense of the verb, in the statement of those propositions which, though past in point of fact (i. e. as to the *absolute* time in which the statement is made) are recalled by the memory as if they were present. Example: دِي شَب كُذَرَم نَزْدِ دُوستِي اُفْتَاد دَر آنجَا عَجَب بَزمِي مِي بِينَم وَطُرفَه تَمَاشَائِي مِي كُنَم *last night I went to the house of a friend, and there saw* (see) *a delightful assembly, and enjoyed* (enjoy) *a most pleasing spectacle*. Of this nature," adds he, "are the examples پِيغَامبَر چُنَان خَبَر مِي دِهَد. مُصَنِّف چُنِين گُوِيَد. *The writer thus observes: the Prophet informs* (or has informed) *us*."—This must bring to every one's mind, the φησι, *ait*, and *inquit* of the Greeks and Latins, which are used in the same way, and upon the same principle. I must also remark, that the translation which puts this *present tense* in the *preterite*, or *future*, in the English or other European languages, as circumstances may require, will not always be incorrect; although there may be cases when it will. See also Mr. Lumsden's Gram. pp. 349—355, with reference to the method of making citations.

less remote from the time in which any declaration is made, answering to our imperfects, perfects, pluperfects: simple, compound, or, paulo-post, futures, may be formed at the pleasure of the writer. The following passage from Isaiah must suffice on this subject: כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה לִמְשִׁיחוֹ לְכוֹרֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־הֶחֱזַקְתִּי בִימִינוֹ לְרַד־לְפָנָיו גּוֹיִם וּמָתְנֵי מְלָכִים אֲפַתֵּחַ לְפָתֹחַ לְפָנָיו דְּלָתַיִם וּשְׁעָרִים לֹא יִסָּגֵרוּ: אֲנִי לְפָנֶיךָ אֵלֵךְ וַהֲדוּרִים אַיְשֵׁר דַּלְתוֹת נְחוּשָׁה אֲשַׁבֵּר וּבְרִיחֵי בַרְזֶל אֲגַדֵּעַ: וְנָתַתִּי לְךָ אוֹצְרוֹת חֹשֶׁךְ וּמַטְמֻנֵי מִסְתָּרִים לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה הַקּוֹרֵא בְשִׁמְךָ &c. *thus* HATH *Jehovah said to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I* HAVE HOLDEN, *for the subduing of nations before him, and that I* MAY UNLOOSE *the loins of kings; to open before him the two-leaved gates, and* (that the) *gates* MAY *not* BE SHUT: *I* GO, OR WILL GO, *before thee, and* MAKE LEVEL *mountainous places: the gates of brass* DO *I* BREAK, *and the bars of iron* DO *I* CUT ASUNDER. *And I have given thee the treasures of darkness, and the hidden treasures of secret places, that thou* MAYEST KNOW, *that I am Jehovah who* CALL (thee) *by thy name,* &c., Is. xlv. 1—3.

Although this citation is not quite direct in the first instance, the passage is nevertheless all put in the first person, as is also the following, which is a direct citation. As to the tenses, the first verb is in the preterite, because the prophet recites what he had already received, perhaps at some distance of time. The next is also preterite as referring to past events. The following אֲפַתֵּחַ and יִסָּגֵרוּ *are present* as having reference to what may have been done at the time when the declaration was made, or immediately subsequent to it. The same may be said of the four following verbs. The next, נָתַתִּי is a preterite to be taken in an absolute future signification (see Art. 246.); and the following תֵּדַע is present to the fulfilment of this or immediately subsequent to it. The second preterite, הֶחֱזַקְתִּי seems here to refer to time anterior to that of אָמַר, with which the declaration commences, though perhaps not so much so as to bear our

pluperfect in the translation. The next two, אֲפַתֵּחַ and יְסַגְּרוּ, though presents or futures to הֶחֱזַקְתִּי, seem, nevertheless, to be anterior to אָמַר as to tense. In the next place, אֵלֵךְ, אֲנַשֵּׁר, and אַבְדִּיעַ are evidently present or future to אָמַר, and consequently, in a tense future to אֲפַתֵּחַ and יְסַגְּרוּ. In the last place, נָתַתִּי is manifestly future with respect to the preceding verb אַבְדִּיעַ, &c.: and תֵּדַע, which is present or immediately future to this, may be considered as referring to something still further removed into futurity. Numerous instances of this kind occur in the New Testament. For examples, in which the present tense is thus carried backward or forward, see Matt. ii. 13, φαίνεται; Mark ii. 4, χαλῶσι, &c. As future, Matt. ii. 4, γενᾶται; Ib. v. 46, ἔχετε; Ib. xvii. 11, ἔρχεται; Ib. xxvi. 29, πίνω. Paulo-post future, Matt. xxvi. 24, παραδιδοῖται; Ib. v. 45. See Mark xiv. 41, Luke xxii. 21, 22, John xiii. 3. 11. 27. 33, &c. In like manner, the Aorists are also used for the past, present, or future. It will be unnecessary to give examples of the past. Of the present, Matt. iii. 17, εὐδόκησα. So Ib. xxiii. 2, Luke i. 47, xv. 16, John i. 12, 1 John iv. 8. Of the future, John xi. 56, ἔλθη: xv. 6, ἐβλήθη, ἐξηράνθη. See also Rom. viii. 20. With πρὶν or πρὸ preceding, Mark xiv. 30, John iv. 49, viii. 58, xiii. 19, &c. See also Matthiæ's Greek Grammar, vol ii. Art. 504, 505, &c.

14th, From what has been said, it must have appeared, that the writer placing both himself and his reader in times contemporary with the events of which he is treating, can supply the deficiency of tenses apparent in the Hebrew paradigm; an expedient often resorted to, indeed, by the Latin and Greek historians, without the necessity which presents itself here. We must not suppose, however, from this circumstance, that they never recur to the original time from which they set out. This they seem to do optionally, just as we find it done in the Greek and Latin historians* (Art. 244. 6.): e. g. וַיִּקְרָא

---

* This is often done in the same construction: e. g. "INSTANT *Volsci recentes, qui è castris impetum* FECERANT; INTEGRANT *et illi pugnam, qui simulata* CESSERANT *fuga.* Livy, lib. vi. §. 24. Ἐπ' ἀκρας δ', Ἔφη ὦ κῦρε, τὴν

אֱלֹהִים לָאוֹר יוֹם וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא לָיְלָה *and God* CALLS *the light day: but the darkness he* CALLED *night,* Gen. i. 5; וַיַּנִּיחוּ אֹתוֹ עַד־הַבֹּקֶר כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה וְלֹא הִבְאִישׁ *so they* LAY IT UP *till the morning, as Moses* HAD COMMANDED, *and it* DID *not* BECOME *fœtid,* &c. Exod. xvi. 24.

245. If then, events consecutive of each other may be enounced by verbs intimating a presence of action, with reference to those primarily introduced into the context, then may Subjunctive or Conditional sentences also be enounced upon the same principle, by the present tense, while the dependence of the different members one upon another will be determined by *the signification of the particles* introduced for that purpose.* Examples: Gen. xxiv. 49. 50, וְעַתָּה אִם־יֶשְׁכֶם עֹשִׂים חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת אֶת־אֲדֹנִי הַגִּידוּ לִי וְאִם־לֹא הַגִּידוּ לִי וְאֶפְנֶה עַל־יָמִין אוֹ עַל־שְׂמֹאל: *and now, if ye* ARE DEALING *kindly and truly with my master, tell me; and if not, tell me; and I turn* (or *that* I MAY TURN) *to the right hand or to the left;* Ib. v. 5, וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו הָעֶבֶד אוּלַי לֹא־תֹאבֶה הָאִשָּׁה לָלֶכֶת אַחֲרַי אֶל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת הֲהָשֵׁב אָשִׁיב אֶת־בִּנְךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יָצָאתָ מִשָּׁם: *then the servant said* (says) *to him, perhaps the woman* MAY *not* BE WILLING *to follow me to*

γυναῖκα, ἤν με ΚΕΛΕΥΕΙΣ φυλάττειν; Μὰ Δί ΕΦΗ ὁ κῦρος, &c. Xenoph. Cyropedia. Pantheia. See Matthiæ's Greek Gram. vol. ii. Art. 504. 1.

* Professor Stewart lays it down as a rule (after Dr. Gesenius), that the apocopated and paragogic forms of the present tense are generally to be taken in a subjunctive or intensitive signification, respectively. (Heb. Gram. pp. 161—2, &c. Andover, America, 1823.) After paying considerable attention to this subject, I must confess, I cannot see any necessity for this rule; because I find cases almost innumerable, wherein the common form of the present is to be taken as a subjunctive, optative, &c. according to the force of the particles, with which it is accompanied; and because I cannot perceive the least possible difference of meaning between either forms when so accompanied. The same may perhaps be said of the paragogic forms. Euphony is probably the sole reason why one form is used at one time, and another at another.

this land, must I surely bring back thy son unto the land from whence thou camest? Ib. xxvii. 4, וַעֲשֵׂה־לִי מַטְעַמִּים כַּאֲשֶׁר אָהַבְתִּי וְהָבִיאָה לִי וְאֹכְלָה בַּעֲבוּר תְּבָרֶכְךָ נַפְשִׁי *and make for me meats such as I have loved, and bring to me,* THAT I MAY EAT, IN ORDER THAT MY SOUL MAY BLESS THEE.

2d, For the same reason, Commands, Prohibitions, Blessings, Deprecations, and the like, will generally be enounced, either by the Imperative, or by the present tense. Examples: Gen. xxiv. 60, הֱיִי לְאַלְפֵי רְבָבָה וְיִירַשׁ זַרְעֲךָ אֵת שַׁעַר שֹׂנְאָיו: BECOME *thou thousands of myriads, and* LET *thy seed* POSSESS *the gate of those that hate them;* Gen. xxvii. 3, וְעַתָּה שָׂא־נָא כֵלֶיךָ תֶּלְיְךָ וְקַשְׁתֶּךָ וְצֵא הַשָּׂדֶה וְצוּדָה לִי צָיִד TAKE *now, I pray, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and* GO OUT, *into the plain, and* HUNT *for me a hunting;* Ib. 26, גְּשָׁה־נָּא וּשָׁקָה־לִי בְּנִי: COME NEAR, *I pray, and* KISS *me, my son;* Ib. 28, וְיִתֶּן־לְךָ הָאֱלֹהִים מִטַּל הַשָּׁמַיִם *and* MAY *God* GIVE *thee of the dew of heaven,* &c.; Is. v. 19, יְמַהֵר יָחִישָׁה מַעֲשֵׂהוּ לְמַעַן נִרְאֶה וְתִקְרַב וְתָבוֹאָה עֲצַת קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנֵדָעָה: LET HIM HASTEN, HURRY *his work that we may see* (it), *and* LET *the counsel of the Holy One of Israel* DRAW NIGH, *that we may know* (it); Ps. xxxvii. 1, אַל־תִּתְחַר בַּמְּרֵעִים אַל־תְּקַנֵּא בְּעֹשֵׂי עַוְלָה: BE NOT IRRITATED *at those who are evil,* ENVY THOU *not the workers of iniquity.*

246. Another leading principle, by which the tenses are regulated, arises from the circumstance, that the Hebrews, in common with some other nations of the East, often represent events, of the future occurrence of which they have no doubt, as *having already taken place.**

---

* The following observations, on this use of the past tense of a Persian verb, are taken from the Persian Grammar of Mr. Lumsden, vol. ii. p. 326.

Examples: כִּי־יֶלֶד יֻלַּד־לָנוּ בֵּן נִתַּן־לָנוּ וַתְּהִי הַמִּשְׂרָה עַל־שִׁכְמוֹ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ אֵל גִּבּוֹר אֲבִי־עַד שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם :

"The prophetic denunciation of a future event will be often expressed in the past tense, in order to indicate the certainty of its occurrence. Examples: كَافِرْ إِمْرُوز أَگَرچِه خُوشَ است لِيكِنْ فَرْدَاسْت كِه طَوْقِ لَعْنَتْ بَر گَرْدَنْ كَشِيدَه وَبَانْوَاعِ عَذَاب گِرِفتَار گَرْدِيدَه "*The infidel, however happy to-day, will be encircled to-morrow by a collar of curses, and will suffer miseries of every description.*"

"It seems to me," continues Mr. Lumsden, "that most of the preceding rules have their basis in the following principle ... that the occurrence of a future event is naturally a matter of great uncertainty, and generally speaking, will be so considered, if expressed by the future tense of the verb. Past events having already occurred, are subject to no uncertainty at all. And hence it happens, that a Persian, having occasion to speak of a future event, which he believes to be of certain occurrence, will naturally enough employ the past tense of the verb: by the use of which he means to apprise his auditor, that the occurrence of the event, though still future, is, in his opinion, not less certain, than if it were past."

Of this character is the passage cited by Mr. de Sacy, from the "*Concessus*" of Hariri, Arab. Gram. vol. i. p. 123. &c. لَا تَلمَظَنَّ بِقِرَاكُم أَوْ I WILL BY NO MEANS TOUCH *your meat, unless*, &c. Storr, p. 163—4. Pococke's Specim. Hist. Arab. p. 57. Gram. Syr. Isaac Sciadrensis, Rom. 1636, p. ممضم, &c.

The following passages copied from a very valuable commentary on the Arabic Grammar of Ibn ul Hájib, by نجم الدين العراقي, and preserved in the public library of Cambridge, will put this question out of all doubt, as to the practice of the Orientals. Speaking of the preterite tense, it is said:

وينصرف الي الاستقبال بالانشاء الطلبي اما دعا نحو رحمك الله او امراً نحو قول علي عليه السلام أَجِزْ أَمْرَ قِرْنَهُ آسا اخاه بنفسه وينصرف الي الاستقبال ايضاً بان يخبر من الامور المستقبلة اذا قُصِد القطع بوقوعها كقوله تعالي ونادي اصحاب الجنة...انّه من حيث افادة المتكلّم لوقوع الفعل قطعاً كانّه وقع ومضي...وينقلب الماضي اليه ايضاً اذا كان

for a child HAS BEEN (i. e. shall surely be) BORN *to us, a Son* HATH BEEN (or surely shall be) GIVEN *to us, and the government is upon his shoulder, and* (one) *calls his name Wonder, Counsellor* (or Preacher), *Mighty God, the Father* (or Proprietor) *of an age, the Prince of peace;* Ib. vii. 18, וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִשְׁרֹק יְהוָה לַזְּבוּב אֲשֶׁר בְּקְצֵה יְאֹרֵי מִצְרָיִם &c. AND IT SHALL (certainly) COME TO PASS, *in that day, Jehovah hisses* (or shall hiss) *to the bee which* (is) *in the extremity of the rivers of Egypt,*

منفياً او ان كان في جواب القَسَم نحو والله لا فعلتُ وان فعلتُ ... وينقلب ايضاً اليه بدخول كَلِم المجازاة غير لو واما كان فقد يبقي معها علي المضي نحو قوله تعالي ان كنتُ قلتُه....وينقلب ايضاً بدخول ما النايبة عن الظرف...نحو ما دامت السّموات &c. i. e. "*The preterite takes the future signification, when used as intimating desire—prayer: as,* رحمك الله MAY GOD HAVE MERCY ON THEE;—*or, command, as in the saying of Ali,* LET THE MAN REWARD HIS NEIGHBOUR (اجزا pret.) WHO IN HIS OWN PERSON HAS DONE GOOD TO HIS BROTHER. *It is also changed into the future, when speaking of some future event, and intending to enounce it* AS CERTAIN TO COME TO PASS: *as in the passage from the Koran: The inhabitants of Paradise* SHALL *call, &c.* (have called. Surat. Alaraf.) *where the speaker mentions the event as* HAVING ALREADY COME TO PASS. *It is also taken as a future, when accompanied by a negative, or, as an answer to an oath: as,* BY GOD, I WILL NOT DO IT, *or,* SHOULD I DO IT. *It is also used as a future in hypothetical sentences, excepting with the particle* لو SHOULD, UNLESS, &c. *But, as to the verb* كَانَ, *it will retain its preterite signification: as,* IF I HAD SAID IT. *It is also changed when the particle* ما *is used intimating time:* e. g. AS LONG AS THE HEAVENS SHALL ENDURE," &c. It is very evident, that the same principle prevails throughout every instance here adduced, (if we except the hypothetical ones, of which something will be said hereafter, and كَانَ which is used as an auxiliary), namely, that of *certainty*, and thence *intense petition*, or *command*, which seem to have been grafted upon this certainty.

&c.; Ib. 19, וּבָאוּ וְנָחוּ כֻלָּם בְּנַחֲלֵי הַבָּתּוֹת וּבִנְקִיקֵי הַסְּלָעִים &c. AND THEY SHALL (certainly) COME, AND SHALL ALL REST *in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks.*

2d, Upon the same principle, the Preterite tense is often used as an *Imperative;* which may, therefore, be termed *emphatical:* e. g. Deut. vi. 5, וְאָהַבְתָּ אֵת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל־לְבָבְךָ וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁךָ וּבְכָל־מְאֹדֶךָ : וְהָיוּ הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מְצַוְּךָ הַיּוֹם עַל־לְבָבֶךָ : וְשִׁנַּנְתָּם לְבָנֶיךָ וְדִבַּרְתָּ בָּם בְּשִׁבְתְּךָ בְּבֵיתֶךָ וּבְלֶכְתְּךָ בַדֶּרֶךְ וּבְשָׁכְבְּךָ וּבְקוּמֶךָ : וּקְשַׁרְתָּם לְאוֹת עַל־יָדֶךָ וְהָיוּ לְטֹטָפֹת בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ : וּכְתַבְתָּם עַל־מְזוּזוֹת בֵּיתֶךָ וּבִשְׁעָרֶיךָ : *and thou* SHALT (surely) LOVE *Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day* SHALL BE *upon thy heart: and thou* SHALT DILIGENTLY IMPRESS *them upon thy children: and thou* SHALT TALK *of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And* THOU SHALT BIND *them for a sign on thy hand, and* THEY SHALL BE *for frontlets between thy eyes. And thou* SHALT WRITE *them upon the posts of thy house, and upon thy gates.*

3d, In the following example, we have both the preterite and present tenses, to be construed as *prophetical* futures: the former necessarily so, as intimating something immediately consequent upon the action of the leading verb גּוּר; the other, for the reasons just given (Art. 244. 11. 12.).

Gen. xxvi. 3, גּוּר בָּאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת וְאֶהְיֶה עִמְּךָ וַאֲבָרְכֶךָּ כִּי־לְךָ וּלְזַרְעֲךָ אֶתֵּן אֶת־כָּל־הָאֲרָצֹת הָאֵל וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־הַשְּׁבֻעָה אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאַבְרָהָם אָבִיךָ : *sojourn in this land, and I am,* or WILL BE, *with thee, and I bless,* or WILL BLESS, *thee; for to thee and to thy seed I give,* or

WILL GIVE, *all these lands: and* I WILL (surely) ESTABLISH *the oath which I sware to Abraham thy father.*

4th, The following exhibits a prohibitive sentence in the Present, followed by two predictions enounced in the Preterite tense: Gen. xxvi. 24, אַל־תִּירָא כִּי־אִתְּךָ אָנֹכִי וּבֵרַכְתִּיךָ וְהִרְבֵּיתִי אֶת־זַרְעֲךָ *fear not, for I* (am) *with thee, and* WILL (surely) BLESS *thee, and* MULTIPLY *thy seed.*

5th, When a preterite follows a present tense in the same order of events, and in the same context, the second of these, with as many succeeding verbs as follow in the same tense, order, &c. may be translated by the English compound tense, *shall have—shall have had*— or the like* (Art. 244. 8.). Examples: Deut. vii. 1, כִּי יְבִיאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה בָא־שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ וְנָשַׁל גּוֹיִם־רַבִּים מִפָּנֶיךָ ... וּנְתָנָם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ וְהִכִּיתָם הַחֲרֵם תַּחֲרִים אוֹתָם &c. *when Jehovah thy God* BRINGETH THEE *to the land whither thou art going to possess it,* and SHALL HAVE CAST OUT *many great nations from before thee .... and Jehovah thy God* SHALL HAVE DELIVERED *them up before thee,* and thou SHALT HAVE SMITTEN *them,* (then) *devote thou them to utter destruction.*

6th, In like manner, when two events are enounced, one of which is prior to the other, that which occurred first in the order, being to be taken in the past tense, with reference to the time in which the relation is made, the following one may be translated into English in the

---

* In this case, the preterite is reckoned, not from the period in which the declaration is made, but in one future to it, even in the English.

*preterpluperfect tense:** as, Gen. xxvi. 18, וַיִּקְרָא לָהֶן שֵׁמוֹת כַּשֵּׁמוֹת אֲשֶׁר־קָרָא לָהֶן אָבִיו: *and he calls them* (by) *names, according to the names* (by) *which his father* CALLED THEM (i. e. had called.).

247. General opinions may be enounced either in the preterite, the participles, or in the present tense. Examples: Ps. i. 1, אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא הָלַךְ בַּעֲצַת רְשָׁעִים וּבְדֶרֶךְ חַטָּאִים לֹא עָמָד וּבְמוֹשַׁב לֵצִים לֹא יָשָׁב: *blessed* (is) *the man who* HATH NOT WALKED *in the counsel of the wicked, and* HATH NOT STOOD *in the way of sinners, and* HATH NOT RESIDED *in the habitation of the scorners;*†

---

* In this case, the verb יִקְרָא is an historical *present* with reference to the preceding verb יָשַׁב, and therefore preterite with reference to the time in which the narration is made: but, the following verb קָרָא is preterite with reference to this time, i. e. the time of יָשַׁב and יִקְרָא, it is, therefore, a preterite still more remote, which is equivalent to our pluperfect. So كَانَ خَرَجَ in Arabic. See p. 347. note.

† So in the Arabic لَوْ أَخَذْتَنِي مَعَكَ لَعَمِلْتُ عَسَلاً مِثْلَكَ *had you taken me with you, I had made honey like yourself;* لَوْ كَانَ النَّاسُ كُلُّهُم عُقَلاَ خَرِبَتِ الدُّنيَا HAD IT BEEN (so that) *all men were wise, the world* HAD BEEN DESTROYED. Mr. Lumsden has, I think, been very happy in his remarks on this sort of construction. "General opinions," says he, "ought to result from the observation of facts; and whether we state a general opinion, or the facts on which an opinion is founded, the effect is the same in either case. An Englishman will commonly state the opinion, as 'Force cannot cope with fortune:' and a Persian will be often disposed to state the facts on which the opinion is founded; as 'The strong have been generally foiled in the contest with fortune.' This, therefore," adds he, "is a case in which the past may be said to supercede the future tense of the verb." Example; كَزِين پَس بَه كُنَجِي نَشِينَم چُو مُورِكَه رُوزِي نَخوردند پِيلان بزور "*henceforward I shall*

Prov. xxviii. 7, נוֹצֵר תּוֹרָה בֵּן מֵבִין וְרֹעֶה זוֹלְלִים יַכְלִים אָבִיו: *an intelligent son* KEEPS *the law; but he who* ATTENDS *upon base men,* PUTS *his father to shame;* Ps. xi. 4, לֹא־יוֹעִיל הוֹן בְּיוֹם עֶבְרָה וּצְדָקָה תַּצִּיל מִמָּוֶת: *riches* PROFIT *not in the day of wrath; but righteousness* DELIVERS *from death.*

248. Hypothetical sentences, which are very nearly allied to the foregoing, will be enounced in the past, or present, tense, according to one or more of the preceding rules, as it shall suit the intention of the Writer. Examples: Gen. xxvi. 10, מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ לָּנוּ כִּמְעַט שָׁכַב אַחַד הָעָם אֶת־אִשְׁתֶּךָ וְהֵבֵאתָ עָלֵינוּ אָשָׁם: *what is this* (that) *thou hast done to us? some one of the people* MIGHT *lightly* HAVE LAIN *with thy wife, so thou* WOULDEST HAVE BROUGHT *sin upon us;* Ib. xxvii. 12, אוּלַי יְמֻשֵּׁנִי אָבִי וְהָיִיתִי בְעֵינָיו כִּמְתַעְתֵּעַ וְהֵבֵאתִי עָלַי קְלָלָה וְלֹא בְרָכָה:

---

retire and dwell in a corner, like the ant; for even the elephant (which is the strongest of all animals) *cannot master* (has not mastered) *his fortune by force.*" Pers. Gram. vol. ii. p. 326.

The Arabic Grammarians endeavour to account for this use of the verb, which they say must be taken as being in the present tense, by saying, that we have here, الانشاءُ الايقاعي, by which they mean, the retention of an event in the mind, which, although past, as to fact, is nevertheless present in effect: as, بعتُ *I have sold,* and am now dispossessed of the thing sold, اشتريتُ *I have bought,* and do possess, &c., whereas, when we use the present tense in such cases, the thing sold, bought, &c., may be, or not, now in our possession. So we say in English, I AM *come, he* IS *gone,* not I HAVE *come, he* HAS *gone.* And in Hebrew, Is. xiv. 7; נָחָה שָׁקְטָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ פָּצְחוּ רִנָּה &c., *The whole land* IS *at rest, it* IS *quiet* (has been), *they* BREAK *forth* (into) *singing* (have broken forth). See also some of the following verses. This, however, mostly takes place in intransitive verbs, such as חָכַם, יָכֹל, יָדַע, חָלַה, גָּדַל, קָטֹן, or the like.

perhaps my father MAY FEEL *me; so* SHALL I (certainly) BECOME *as a great deceiver in his eyes, and* SHALL (surely) BRING *upon myself a curse and not a blessing;* Prov. vi. 1, בְּנִי אִם־עָרַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ תָּקַעְתָּ לַזָּר כַּפֶּיךָ: .... עֲשֵׂה זֹאת &c., *my son, if thou* HAST BECOME *surety for thy neighbour, if thou* HAST STRICKEN *thy hand with a stranger.* .... *Do this,* &c.; Gen. xxviii. 20, אִם־יִהְיֶה אֱלֹהִים עִמָּדִי וּשְׁמָרַנִי בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ וְנָתַן־לִי לֶחֶם לֶאֱכֹל וּבֶגֶד לִלְבֹּשׁ:—וְהָיָה יְהוָה לִי לֵאלֹהִים: *if God* BE *with me, and* WILL (surely) KEEP *me in this way* (in) *which I go, and* WILL (surely) GIVE *me bread to eat, and clothing to put on,—then* SHALL *Jehovah* (certainly) *be my God.* Is. lxiii. 19, לוּא־קָרַעְתָּ שָׁמַיִם יָרַדְתָּ מִפָּנֶיךָ הָרִים נָזֹלוּ:—מִפָּנֶיךָ גּוֹיִם יִרְגָּזוּ: HADST *thou* RENT *the heavens,* HADST *thou* DESCENDED, HAD *the mountains* BEEN REDUCED *before thee,—the nations* HAD TREMBLED *before thee;** Lev. x. 19,

---

* In translating this passage, I have taken נָזֹלוּ as the *Niphhál* of זָלַל, to which it seems to me most properly to belong, see Simonis's Lexicon *sub voce*, and לוּא as a particle implying supposition, with a negation, according to its most usual import both in Hebrew and Arabic. It should also be observed, that in the first and two last examples, the preterite is used, as in the statement of general opinions, and for the reasons assigned by Mr. Lumsden. The particles preceding such expressions may be considered as intended to put a suppositious case; or, in other words, to lay down a general fact as accidental, and then to deduce the consequence: which may be stated, either in the past or present tense, as circumstances may require. Of this character are the following Arabic examples; لَوْ لَا عَرَفْنَاكَ لَفَعَلْنَا مِثْلَ ذَالِكَ HAD *we not* KNOWN *thee, we* HAD (surely) DONE *after this manner*: or, WE SHOULD (surely) HAVE DONE SO, taking the second member as a future of certainty with respect to the first; لَوْ كُنْتَ هَاهُنَا لَمْ يَمُتْ أَخِي HADST *thou* BEEN *here, my brother* WOULD *not* HAVE DIED; إِنْ فَعَلْتُ ذَلِكَ ضَيَّعْتُ مَالِي HAD I

וְאָכֹלְתִּי חַטָּאת הַיּוֹם הֲיִיטַב בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה׃ *and,* HAD I EATEN *the sin offering to day,* WOULD *it* HAVE (seemed) GOOD *in the eyes of Jehovah?*

Remarks.

249. The preceding rules seem to be governed by two general principles. One, in which the Writer, setting out from the period in which he commences his narrative, follows the different circumstances of it, as though himself and his Reader were present, and dates the tenses of his verbs from the different periods in which he thus places himself; but still reserving the right of returning to his original position whenever he pleases: as already exemplified.

2d, The other leading principle is, to represent events, which it is believed will certainly take place, as having already come to pass: and then, applying this principle to Imperative and other sentences, for the greater emphasis. Nothing, I think, can be more natural than the adoption of such principles. And, when we consider the great degree of precision which their application must communicate to the context, we shall perhaps be induced to believe, that the poverty and uncertainty

---

DONE *this* I SHOULD SURELY HAVE LOST *my wealth;* إِن أنا كثرت علفها

تَبِيضُ بِيضَتَيْنِ DID I INCREASE *her food, she* WOULD (probably) LAY TWO *eggs*; i. e. putting the case, that if I had done so, then she would perhaps hence lay, &c. De Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. i. p. 124, &c.

The Persian examples selected by Mr. Lumsden, seem to me all subject to this distinction, i. e. of certainty or contingency, and to have been enounced accordingly, either in the past, present, or future tense; اگر نرسیدی انتظارت

خواهد کشت HAD *you not* ARRIVED, *the expectation of you,* WOULD (probably) HAVE KILLED (me); اگر امروز بر خلق رحم کنی فردا مرحوم

شدی *if to-day, you* (by any chance) *shew mercy to mankind, to-morrow you* HAVE RECEIVED mercy, i. e. CERTAINLY SHALL RECEIVE it. See Pers. Gram. vol. ii. p. 322, &c.

of which it has been fashionable to accuse the Hebrew language, has rather arisen from our own ignorance, than from any defect inherent in its construction.—Still we do not mean to affirm, that we can always say, why one mode of enunciation is preferred to another, when, as far as we can see, either would have suited the character of the context. In some cases the parallelism may have had some influence, in others attraction: but, upon the whole, I believe we can generally give as good an account of the use of the tenses in the Hebrew, as can be given in either the Greek, Latin, or any other language.

3d, There is, however, a case which has not yet been noticed, and which may probably give some trouble to the Learner, I mean that in which we find discourses, and sometimes books beginning with a verb in the *present tense*, having the particle ו prefixed. I am very much disposed to believe, that this circumstance has contributed in no small degree towards recommending the doctrine, that a *conversive* power (i. e. a power capable of changing the future into a preterite tense, and *vice versâ*) was really inherent in this particle. How a particle,* which has not the least reference to time, could change the tense proper for a certain form of the verb, few perhaps have been able to see: for my own part, I must confess, I never could see the most distant connection between this particle and the tense of any verb: but, as passages such as those alluded to, do occur, it is but right we should endeavour to account for them.

4th, The apparently redundant use of the particle ו then, in passages of this kind, is by no means confined to verbs as the leading words in discourses. The book of Exodus, the first of Kings, and that of Ezra, begin with it prefixed to nouns; and the verbs following appear in their proper tenses. In a great number of passages it also occurs at the beginning of discourses, either with, or without verbs, at the discretion of the Writer,† in all of which the proper tense of the verb

---

* There are a few particles in the Arabic, such as لم , اذا &c., which are also said to have a similar power: but, there is good reason for believing, that this is not the case, which I may perhaps shew hereafter.

† See Noldius, Concord. part. p. 309—10. Ed. 1734. Καί is often used in the same manner in the New Testament, as Matt. vii. 28, ix. 10, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, xxvi. 1, &c. See Noldius as above. Glassius refers this use of ו to a Polysyntheton, Phil. Sacr. p. 513. In some instances this ו occurs in the middle of a verse, as Is. vi. 1. וָאֶרְאֶה, where we can have no doubt, from the preceding context, that the event related is past, the ellipsis of the verb there-

obtains. In the books of Joshua and Judges there is a manifest connection with the context of the preceding books. In these cases, therefore, we shall find no difficulty. Let us now take a few examples from the other books; interpreting this particle according to one of the significations ascribed to it by Noldius; for, I do not believe that it is entirely redundant, but that it is added for the purpose of imparting some expression to the context: e. g. Lev. i. 1, וַיִּקְרָא אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֵלָיו מֵאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לֵאמֹר: so *Jehovah* CALLS *to Moses, and* SPEAKS *to him from the tabernacle of the congregation, saying.*

From the circumstances here alluded to, we can have no doubt, that this is recorded as a past event: and if so, I believe the Writer has taken the liberty of transporting himself and his Reader into former times, without the usual notice, i. e. some term expressive of past time, or a verb in the past tense. The ellipsis then may be of some adverb, or the verb הָיָה (which last is supplied in Arabic by كَانَ, in such passages as, فَكَانَ أَصْحَابُهُ مِنَ الْوُحُوشِ يَأْتِي إِلَيْهِ *and* IT WAS (so that) *his companions from among the beasts come to him.* The particle, in such cases, may be intended merely to excite attention.

5th, But it has been supposed, that הָיָה never occurs, like the كَانَ of the Arabs, as a Preterite to its own Present tense: but, there are many instances in which it does so occur: e. g. Is. vii. 23, וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה כָּל־מָקוֹם &c. *and* IT SHALL COME TO PASS *in that day, that every place* SHALL BE, &c.—To that of others, as, Ib. 21, וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יְחַיֶּה־אִישׁ עֶגְלַת &c. *and* IT SHALL COME TO PASS *in that day that a man* SHALL NOURISH *a calf*, &c.; Ib. 22, וְהָיָה מֵרֹב עֲשׂוֹת חָלָב יֹאכַל חֶמְאָה *and* IT SHALL COME TO PASS, *for the abundance of milk they shall give, that* HE SHALL EAT *butter*, &c. It is no objection to these passages, that הָיָה is to be construed as a future of certainty; because, it is from its being really a preterite tense that this takes place. Nor does it invalidate the argument, that

---

fore introduces no ambiguity: but if we go on to the third verse we shall find two verbs in the preterite tense: an instance of recurrence to the period from which the writer originally set out, and to which this verb is to be referred as a *historical present.*

this verb is not immediately joined with the following one, as it sometimes happens in the Arabic. Every one must see, that they are to be construed together, just as كَانَ must be with يَكُونُ &c., however distant they may be placed from each other. I think, therefore, that the ellipsis of this verb in certain cases (especially as it may be considered as inherent in יִהְיֶה see Art. 242.) can afford no real objection to the theory proposed, and particularly as we know that this, and every other Language, presents omissions equally great.*

6th, This, I think, will be sufficient to explain all the passages thus occurring; the circumstances of the context always admonishing us, in what situation we are to place ourselves, in order to see the just force of the tenses of the verbs.

7th, I would have it, however, particularly borne in mind, that it is not my wish to introduce, in passages like this, any thing differing from our authorized version, except where it shall be absolutely necessary. The preterite has been very properly adopted by the Translators, because WE are in the habit of reckoning our tenses from the period in which we write any narrative. My object is only to account for the Hebrew usage; and to shew, why one tense is at one time chosen, and another at another, where the idiom of our language would admit of no such choice.

8th, I shall merely remark, in conclusion, that the theory here investigated holds good in all the dialects of the Hebrew; viz. the Arabic, the Ethiopic, the Syriac, the Chaldaic, the Samaritan; and, that it has been introduced (as I believe) into the Persic. There are, however, a few peculiarities to be observed in each of these languages, as it is likely would be the case. In Arabic, for example, the ellipsis of كَانَ, equivalent to הָיָה just noticed, seldom takes place. In Ethiopic, the preterite is very rarely used for the purpose of enouncing a *future of certainty*, which is also the case with the Syriac. The general principle, however, is the same; the particulars, are subjects proper for those Grammars, and therefore, need not be investigated here.

---

* That the verb كَانَ is occasionally omitted by the ellipsis (see M. de Sacy's Gram. Arab. vol. ii. Art. 648.), though not often in examples of this kind.

LECTURE XVIII.

ON THE NATURE AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE PARTICLES.

250. We have seen how one or more words may be laid down, for the purpose of enouncing and defining any idea which we intend to communicate to others.

2d, This is perhaps found to be common to all languages, and to all modes of expression. There are, however, certain words and phrases found to prevail in this, as well as other tongues, which, from the frequency of their occurrence, and the peculiar influence which they exert in every species of composition, deserve particular attention. These have been termed *Particles* generally; and, particularly, *Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions,* and *Interjections.*

3d, Generally, all particles, whether *simple* or *compound,* are nothing more than nouns substantive or attributive, placed in the state of *apposition* or *definite* construction, *immediately* or *mediately* with one another, or with the words intended to be qualified by them. The order mentioned on a former occasion (Art. 226. 3.) is also preserved here.

Of the Character and Construction of Adverbs.

251. It has been seen (Art. 234.), that adverbs are nothing more than words added for the purpose of qualifying the signification of verbs generally; we now come to consider some of those cases, which are of the most common occurrence, and which may otherwise present some difficulties to the Learner.

2d, Adverbs in *immediate* connection with verbs may

be considered as *absolute* (Art. 233. 2.), or, as added for the purpose of *specification* (p. 301. note). Those in *mediate* connection, as being in the *definite* state of *construction* with the preceding word or particle; which word or particle may be *absolute* with respect to the verb. General examples are given, Art. 234. The following are some, in which we have attributives singular and plural, pronouns, and particles, thus construed: תֵּרֶד פְּלָאִים *she descends,* WONDERS! i. e. wonderfully, Lam. i. 9; מֵישָׁרִים תִּשְׁפְּטוּ RIGHT THINGS *judge ye,* i. e. righteously, Ps. lviii. 2; נוֹרָאוֹת נִפְלֵיתָ *in* DREADFUL THINGS, *thou hast become wonderful,* i. e. thou hast become exceedingly wonderful, Ps. cxxxix. 14.

3d, It will immediately be seen, that these instances may all be construed by one or other of the rules already given. So also with pronouns: בָּזֶה *in this* (place), for *here;* כָּזֶה, כֹּה, and כָּזֹאת *like this,* for *thus;* לְמָה, or לָמָּה *for what, why?* בַּאֲשֶׁר *in that which,* i. e. place or time, as the context shall require; or אֲשֶׁר *absolutely,* for *where, when?* or *since, because,* &c.

4th, Negative particles should be considered as affecting the action, &c. of a verb either expressed or understood, and not the existence implied by a noun;*

---

* Such expressions as, *there is no man, no place, nothing,* &c. would be considered as monstrous by an Oriental, whom it would be extremely difficult to persuade, that we were not affirming both the existence and non-existence of the same thing at the same time. They would say, *there is not a man,* &c., which is certainly more natural and intelligible. See p. 300, note.

The Arabs make their adverbs by an indefinite attributive, put absolutely, either in *immediate,* or *mediate,* apposition with the word intended to be qualified, which will be either the subject or the object of the verb, or both: e. g. جَآءَنِي زَيْدٌ رَاكِبًا *Zaid came to me, riding;* ضَرَبْتُ زَيْدًا مَشْدُودًا وَلَقِيتُ عَمْرًا رَاكِبَيْنِ *I struck Zaid violently, and I met Omar, both riding.* In these cases,

e. g. לֹא־עָם *a people,* NOT *strong,* Prov. xxx. 25; לֹא־כֵן עָשׂוּ* NOT so (or, according to Schrœderus, *right*) *have they done,* Jer. xlviii. 30; חֻקִּים לֹא טוֹבִים *statutes* (which are) NOT GOOD, i. e. *not easy,* Ezek. xx. 25. So תֹּהוּ לֹא־דֶרֶךְ EMPTINESS (want of culture, in which there is) *not a way,* Ps. cvii. 40; לֹא אוֹר NOT *giving light,* Amos v. 20; לֹא־שֵׁם לוֹ (there is) NOT *a name to him,* i. e. *he is nameless;* לֹא־אִישׁ (who is) NOT *an eminent man,* לֹא־אָדָם (who is) NOT *a mean man,* Is. xxxi. 8; אָמַרְתִּי לְלֹא־עַמִּי *I will say to* (her who is) NOT *my people,* Hos.

---

the adverbs are put in what is termed the *accusative case,* where the connection seems to be *mediate,* i. e. in which some intervening word is to be understood. In the following, they are in the nominative, and, there the connection is manifestly *immediate.* جَاءَنِي زَيْدٌ وَغُلَامُهُ رَاكِبٌ *Zaid came to me, and his servant* (was) *riding.* The reason given for the first of these examples by the author of the *Hidáyat oon Nahve* (p. ۴۹) is, that a verb is understood: his words are, ومثال ما كان عاملها معني الفعل نحو هٰذَا زَيْدٌ قَائِمًا فان معناه انّه واشير. "The examples in which the signification of a verb was the governing principle, as in, "*this Zaid* (is) *standing,*" require a verb to be understood: thus, "*I intend, I point out.*"—His meaning is this: "as to this Zaid, *I mention him* as standing." And hence he means to shew, why the accusative case is used in such places. Mr. de Sacy gives a different account of this construction, see vol. ii. Art. 630; where he considers رَاكِبًا as intended to point out a sort of logical objective case to the verb جَآءَ. For my own part, I would prefer considering this termination as the fragment of some word formerly used as a postposition, and therefore, as equivalent to the preposition بِ, see note, p. 304, and to be translated thus: *Zaid came to me* IN (the situation of) *a person riding.*

* כּוּן *establish,* &c. Hence כֵּן; and Art. 79. כֵּן *establishing, right, just,* &c.

ii. 25; הַשְּׂמֵחִים לְלֹא דָבָר *those who rejoice in* (that which is) NOT *a matter*, i. e. in a non-reality, Amos vi. 13, &c. In all cases, however, לֹא may be construed as a noun put in the *definite* state of construction with the following word, intimating the want, defect, or the like, of the thing mentioned.

5th, In the particle אַיִן this is still more apparent; for, in that case, it takes the vowels necessary for the state of construction* (Art. 151. 6.): e. g. אֵין מוֹשִׁיעַ WANT, LACK, *of a saviour*, Deut. xxii. 27; לְחַנָּה אֵין יְלָדִים *to Hannah* (was) A WANT *of children*, 1 Sam. i. 2; אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ A WANT *of me hearing*, i. e. I hear not, Jer. xiv. 12; יֵשׁ אָדָם *the* BEING, EXISTING, *of a man*, i. e. there is a man, Eccl. ii. 21; יֵשׁ צַדִּיקִים THE EXISTENCE *of just men*, i. e. there are just men, Eccl. viii. 14; אִם־יֶשְׁנוֹ בָאָרֶץ *if* HIS EXISTENCE (be) *in the land*, i. e. if he be, &c., 1 Sam. xxiii. 23.

6th, When any of these particles follow the word to be qualified, they will, of course, be *absolute:* e. g. כִּי־עַתָּה הֱיִיתֶם לֹא *for now ye have become* (of) NOTHING, Job vi. 21; מַיִם אַיִן *water* (is) NOT; מִסְפּוֹא יֵשׁ *provision*, BEING, i. e. there is provision, Jud. xix. 19.

7th, Similar to לֹא and אַיִן is the construction and force of אָפֵס† *expiring;* hence, *defect, non-existence*, &c.: e. g. אֶפֶס אֱלֹהִים NOT *a God*, or, *no God*, Isa. xlv. 14; אֲנִי וְאַפְסִי עוֹד *I am, and* EXCEPTING ME, *still* (is none), Zeph. ii. 15.

8th, The following are examples of similar construction with the particles: עוֹד‡ *returning, reiteration, yet,*

---

* See Eichhorn's edition of Simonis sub voce. On the etymology of these particles, see Art. 179.

† See also Art. 179. 2. 3.

‡ שׁוּב *returning*, &c.; עָוַד and Art. 93. עוֹד.

still, &c.; הֵן *see, behold;* אַל *defect, want, nothing*, &c. כִּי *marking, observing, inferring, whether, that*, &c.; מִן, or מ, *cutting off, separating, from, non-existence*, &c.; בְּלִי and בִּלְתִּי *growing old, decaying, lack, non-existence;* טֶרֶם *cutting off, defect, want, not existing, not yet*, &c. with or without other particles, &c.: עֹדְךָ מַחֲזִיק THY CONTINUING *a retainer* or *holder*, i. e. thou still retainest, Job ii. 9; בְּעֹד יוֹמָם *in* (being) YET *day*, Jer. xv. 9; בְּעוֹדִי *in* MY STILL *being*, Ps. cxlvi. 2; מֵעוֹדִי *from*, or, *since* MY STILL *existing*, i. e. since my birth, Gen. xlviii. 15; אַבְרָהָם עוֹדֶנּוּ עֹמֵד *Abraham*, HIS CONTINUING *a stander*, i. e. he still stood, Gen. xviii. 22; הִנֵּהוּ עֹשֶׂה BEHOLD HIM, *a doer*, i. e. he does, Jer. xviii. 3; מֵאֵין כָּמוֹךָ FROM (there) NOT BEING (any) *like thee*, Jer. x. 7; שָׂבַעְתָּ קָלוֹן מִכָּבוֹד *thou art filled* (with) *ignominy*, WANTING (being destitute of) *glory, reputation*, Hab. ii. 16.

9th, To this kind of construction may be referred all those passages which are generally translated by a word in the comparative degree with *than* following it: e. g. Prov. viii. 10, קְחוּ מוּסָרִי וְאַל־כָּסֶף וְדַעַת מֵחָרוּץ נִבְחָר *accept my castigations, and* NOT, i. e. *rather than, silver: and knowledge*, NOT, i. e. rather than, *choice gold:* i. e. put silver and gold out of the question, when these things are proposed, as unworthy of being compared with them. The negative particle occurring here in the first member of the parallelism, is sufficient to determine in what sense that in the second is to be taken. Of this sort of expression is, "If any man come to me, and *hate* not his father and mother," &c. Luke xiv. 26, John xii. 25, &c. where this hatred, or rather disregard, is not spoken of as being *absolute*, but *relative*.

10th, So with other negative particles, לֹא־אַתֶּם שְׁלַחְתֶּם אֹתִי הֵנָּה כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים *you have not sent me hither*, BUT *God*, Gen. xlv. 8, i. e. *it is* NOT *you, but rather God*, &c. See Exod. xvi. 8, 1 Sam. viii. 7, Jer. vii. 22. 23, Hos. i. 9, vi. 6, Ps. li. 18, Eccl. iv. 9, and Matt. xxiii. 23, Luke x. 20, xiv. 12. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 6. See Storr, p. 251, &c.

Examples of בְּלִי, &c.: עַד־בְּלִי יָרֵחַ *until the* DECAY,

CESSATION, *of the moon,* i. e. as long as it shall endure, Ps. lxxii. 7; עַד־בְּלִתִּי שָׁמַיִם *until* THE DEFECT *of the heavens,* i. e. as long as they shall last, Job xiv. 12; מִבְּלִי הַשְׁאִיר־לוֹ כֹּל *from* THE NOT *leaving to him any thing,* Deut. xxviii. 55; לִבְלְתִּי־שׁוּב *for the* LACK *of returning,* i. e. the not returning, Ezek. xiii. 22; מִבְּלְתִּי לִבְלְתִּי יְכֹלֶת *from the* LACK *of power,* Num. xiv. 16; תֶּחֱטָאוּ *for the* ABSENCE *of your sinning,* i. e. that you should not sin, Exod. xx. 20; הֲמִבְּלִי אֵין־קְבָרִים *is it from the* WANTING, or, *is not there* A DEFICIENCY, *of graves?* Exod. xiv. 11; בְּטֶרֶם־לֹא בָוֹא *in its* NOT YET *coming,* Zeph. ii. 2.

In these two last, as well as in מֵאֵין כָּמוֹךָ Jer. x. 7, cited above, Schrœderus thinks that some emphasis is apparent in the multiplication of the negative particles. I must confess, I do not think so. In many cases, and perhaps in some of those given above, these particles may stand as prepositions or conjunctions, that is, with reference to the words with which they are to be construed: for, in no other point of view can they differ, all of them being nouns, or fragments of nouns, added for the purpose of qualifying some other word, as already mentioned.

11th, The following are examples of prepositions in immediate connection with the word to be qualified, restricted, &c.: מִן־חָם הַיּוֹשְׁבִים שָׁם לְפָנִים OF HAM (were) *the dwellers there of former* (times), 1 Chron. iv. 40; כְּקוֹל מַיִם רַבִּים LIKE *the sound of many waters,* Ezek. i. 24; נַפְשִׁי כְּאֶרֶץ־עֲיֵפָה לָךְ *my soul* (is) *like a parched land* (with respect) TO *thee,* Ps. cxliii. 6.

In these, and all similar cases, it will be of no consequence whether we consider the particles as being in apposition, or in the definite state of construction, there being no mark of case in the Hebrew. The latter is perhaps the most conformable with analogy; because, in some of the particles we have the form proper for that state, as in אֶל־קֶבֶר TO *the grave,* Job v. 26; עַל־שׁוּר OVER *the wall,* Gen. xlix. 22; particularly when they have the plural form, e. g. אַחֲרֵי מֹשֶׁה *after Moses,* Exod. xxxiii. 8; and in the Arabic always,

as, عَلَى ٱلْمَسْجِدِ, i. e. THE UPPER (part) *of the mosque*, for OVER *the mosque*. See Art. 179. 3.

12th, Examples of mediate construction, i. e. when one or more other particles intervene: ... לְמַעַן לָמוּג לֵב נָתַתִּי אִבְחַת־חָרֶב FOR THE PURPOSE OF *melting* (the) *heart ... have I appointed the chastisement of the sword*, Ezek. xxi. 20; בָּא עַד־אֲלֵיהֶם *he came* UP TO *them*, i. e. even to them, 2 Kings ix. 20; לְבַד מִטַּף *for each*, EXCLUDING *infants*, i. e. with respect to the men, excluding the children, or, beside the children, Exod. xii. 37; מִחוּץ לְחוֹמָה *from without*, (with respect) TO *the wall*, Jer. xxi. 4.

13th, The intervening particles most in use are, ל and מ, which seem to be added for the purpose of marking the word to which the preceding one has some relation, and to point out the nature of that relation, e. g. תַּחַת לְרֹאשִׁי *beneath* (with reference) TO *my head*, i. e. *under my head*, Cant. ii. 6; חוּצָה לָעִיר *outwards* (with reference) TO *the city*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 15; אֶל־מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת *to* (that which is) FROM *within* (with respect) TO *the veil*, Lev. xvi. 15; אֹרַח חַיִּים לְמַעְלָה לְמַשְׂכִּיל לְמַעַן סוּר מִשְּׁאוֹל מָטָּה *the way of life*, or, *religious instruction* (is) FOR *the elevating* OF *the understanding* (person), FOR *the purpose of receding from the grave beneath*, Prov. xv. 24; חָשַׂכְתָּ לְמַטָּה מֵעָוֹנֵנוּ *thou hast refrained* (with reference) TO *bringing down* (degrading) ON ACCOUNT OF *our sins*, Ezra ix. 13.

Of this kind are the combinations עַד לְמֵאוֹ 2 Chron. xvi. 14; עַד לְמַעְלָה Ib. xvii. 12; עַד לְאֵין מַרְפֵּא Ib. xxxvi. 16, &c.

So, אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל וַאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתָּחַת וַאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ: *which* (is) *in the heavens from above, and which* (is) *in the earth from beneath, and which* (is) *in the waters from beneath* (with respect) *to the earth*, Exod. xx. 4.

The phrases here used, *from above*, and *from beneath*, must necessarily be taken relatively: in the first instance, *above*, with respect to the earth; in the second, by ל *beneath*, with respect to the heavens; and, in the third, *beneath*, or *low*, with reference to the earth, which is ex-

pressed by ל: i. e. Thou shalt make no image of the heavenly bodies which are above, nor of the creatures, &c. which are on the earth beneath; nor of those which are in the waters, which are still lower than the earth: not, which are "*in the waters under the earth*," &c. Hence will be seen the necessity of carefully observing, to what words these particles have an immediate reference; and not to take them absolutely, as is often the case in our own, and other, languages.

14th, When the preposition בֵּין *between*, is not repeated, and is used for the purpose of opposing one noun to another, it has this peculiarity, that it requires the insertion of ל before the latter: e. g. בֵּין מַיִם לָמָיִם *between waters* (as opposed) TO *waters*, Gen. i. 6; בֵּין דִּין לְדִין *between cause* (as opposed) TO *cause*, i. e. *between cause and cause*, Deut. xvii. 8. But, if this word is repeated, its influence is *immediate*: e. g. בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין הַחשֶׁךְ BETWEEN *the light, and* BETWEEN *the darkness*, Gen. i. 4. Whence it will appear, that ל in the one case is made equivalent to that of בֵּין in the other, as to the whole sense given.

15th, From what has been said on the primitive and derived significations of words (Art. 154.), it will be easy to conceive how cases might occur, in which it will be exceedingly difficult to ascertain the precise force of these particles; and consequently, the relation between words which they are intended to point out and define. Generally, however, either the primitive, or one or other of the derived, senses of the particle, considered in conjunction with the context, will afford us sufficient light.

16th, To attempt, however, to translate every such word, by a corresponding one in English, especially when several of them are compounded together, will be to evince a greater attention to the letter, than to the spirit, of the Sacred Writers; and, will better merit the appellation of κακοζηλος, which was formerly given to Aquila by a very learned Father of the Church, than that of a faithful Translator. It is very desirable, nevertheless, to ascertain their force as nearly as we can, and to express that in the most intelligible way our language may admit of: this, however, will always depend upon the extent of our reading, and the accuracy of our judgment.

17th, The following instances, taken from Glassius, are intended to shew, how these particles influence certain

modes of expression; *יֵלְכוּ מֵחַיִל אֶל־חָיִל *they proceed* FROM *strength* TO *strength*, i. e. *they become stronger and stronger*, Ps. lxxxiv. 8; כִּי מֵרָעָה אֶל־רָעָה יָצָאוּ *for they go out* FROM *evil* to *evil*, i. e. *they become worse and worse*, Jer. ix. 2.

For similar expressions in the Greek Testament, see Rom. i. 17, vi. 19, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Phil. ii. 27, &c.

18th, Of the particles which signify motion towards,† or rest in, a place, the following are examples. The first ־ָה, is, more properly a postposition like the Latin *versus*: e. g. וַיָּבֹאוּ שְׁנֵי הַמַּלְאָכִים סְדֹמָה *and two of the angels came* TO *Sodom*, Gen. xix. 1; עַד אֲשֶׁר־אָבֹא אֶל־ אֲדֹנִי שְׂעִירָה *until I come in* UNTO *my Lord* TOWARDS *Seir*, Gen. xxxiii. 14.

See Gen. x. 19, xii. 5, xlvi. 1. 4, Deut. ii. 13, 1 Kings xviii. 45, xix. 15, Jer. xxix. 15, Jon. i. 3. In the following passages ל is also prefixed, Ps. ix. 18, 1 Chron. xxvi. 17. See Art. 193. 15. 16.

19th, In the following אֶל seems to have the same force with ב: .... אֲנִי נֶאֱסָף אֶל־עַמִּי קִבְרוּ אֹתִי אֶל־אֲבֹתָי

---

* So in the Arabic من ناحية الي ناحية *from part to part*, i. e. proceeding on. Tale of Sindbad, Ed. Langlés, p. ۱۰, &c. So also χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, *grace for grace*, i. e. an increase or excess of grace, far surpassing that of the Law of Moses, John i. 16.

† In this respect the postposition ־ָה, the prepositions אֶל, עַל, עַד, and ל, are found to have the same, or very nearly the same, force. From the construction and sense in which this particle is found, there is good reason for supposing, that it is the same with اً which is said to mark the Arabic accusative: and, it is probably derived from the same root. No one I think can read הַשְׁלִיכֵהוּ אַרְצָה *cast it to the earth*, Exod. iv. 3, and اطرحوه أرضًا &c. Surat of Joseph, without being struck with the identity of the expression in each case, especially when we are told, that the nasal of the Arabic is disregarded in common conversation. In this case too, we have no intervening particle, which is perhaps supplied by the final one; yet, in other cases, we find each of these verbs construed also with ב, ל, אל, על, מן, as may be seen in Castell.

אֶל־הַמְּעָרָה .... בַּמְּעָרָה &c. *as for me,* (I am) *to be gathered* TO *my people; bury me:*—TO *my fathers,* TO *the cave* .... IN *the cave,* &c., Gen. xlix. 29, 30.

But here, the particle אֶל seems to refer in every case to the verb נֶאֱסַף, and ב in v. 30, to קִבְרוּ: and, if so, these particles retain their usual and proper signification. So 1 Kings viii. 30; וְשָׁמַעְתָּ אֶל־תְּחִנַּת עַבְדְּךָ וְעַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יִתְפַּלְלוּ אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁמַע אֶל־מְקוֹם שִׁבְתְּךָ אֶל־הַשָּׁמָיִם *and attend thou to the supplication of thy servant and of thy people Israel, who shall pray* TOWARDS *this place: and give ear thou* TO *the place of thy dwelling,*—TOWARDS *heaven.*

The last two words here must, I think, be referred to the preceding יִתְפַּלְלוּ; and, if so, the construction will be regular and the signification of the particle אֶל constant. Constructions of this sort are frequent in Hebrew and Arabic. See Ps. l. 15, lvi. 9, &c.; Sheikh Ahmed's preface to the *Ikhwán Ossafá,* p. 4.

In those passages, in which ב takes the signification of אֶל I can see no anomaly: for, if this particle be derived from בּוֹא *to enter into* (see Art. 182.), it retains its primitive signification in such passages as Lev. xvi. 22; בְּמִדְבָּר &c. Phil. Sacr. p. 454.

Again, in the use of אֶל for *concerning,* Job xlii. 8, Ezek. xxi. 33, Ps. ii. 7, lxix. 27, I can see no greater irregularity, than what occurs in other words; for, although אֶל is occasionally, and perhaps primarily, used in the sense of *motion towards a place;* yet, as its signification may also be applied to the operations of the mind, it may then mean, that the subject of any discourse is directed *towards,* or is *concerning,* any person or thing.

And, again, if we carefully consider the primitive and derived senses which this particle, and עַל may have, we shall then see no difficulty in occasionally finding them used the one for the other. See Lev. xiv. 50, 1 Sam. iv. 21, 2 Sam. ii. 9, xxi. 1, Is. xxxii. 6, Ezek. iii. 9, &c.

20th, After what has been said on the variety of significations which words will necessarily sustain (Art. 154), and on the principles by which the construction of these particles are regulated, it cannot be necessary to pursue this subject further here. I would only offer one remark, which is this; Let the Learner carefully consider, to what word or thing the particle is to be referred, whether to the person speaking, the person or thing spoken of, or, whether it is not merely intended to supply some shade of meaning to some other particle or particles in the same context. He may also consult the Grammatices Sacræ Appendix by Glassius, Ed. Dathe, p. 556, &c., and should always have at hand the Concordantiæ particularum, by Noldius, Ed. Jenæ, 1734.

LECTURE XIX.

ON THE NATURE AND USE OF THE CONJUNCTIONS.

252. Words standing in the situation of conjunctions in the Hebrew, are subject to the laws of *apposition* and *definite construction*, just as other words are. In many instances, indeed, they are the same words which, at other times, are used as pronouns, adverbs, or prepositions; the situation alone in which they are found, giving them the character of conjunctions. A few indeed, such as וְ, גַּם, &c.* are used only as conjunctions.

Examples in which the Relative Pronoun אֲשֶׁר *is used as a Conjunction.*†

וַיַּרְא שָׁאוּל אֲשֶׁר־הוּא מַשְׂכִּיל AND *Saul saw* THAT (ID QUOD) *he* (was) *intelligent*, 1 Sam. xviii. 15; אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה דָּוִד אֶת־הַיָּשָׁר (because) THAT *David did what* (was) *right*, &c., i. e. *eo quod fecit*, &c., 1 Kings xv. 5; וְיָשָׁב הֶעָפָר עַל־הָאָרֶץ כְּשֶׁהָיָה *and the dust returns to the earth like* WHAT *it was*, Eccl. xii. 7.

2d, Of *adverbs, prepositions*, &c. simple or compound: בִּלְתִּי אִם־לָקַח UNLESS *he have taken*, Amos iii. 4; עֵקֶב כִּי בָזִתָנִי *a consequence* THAT *thou hast despised me*,

---

* The first of these seems to be derived from נָו *a hook, connector*, &c. and consequently, to signify, *in addition, besides, and*, &c. The second is probably from the word גָּם *multiplying, becoming abundant*, or the like, and equivalent to our *moreover, much more*, &c. See Storr, p. 337.

† But in many cases אֲשֶׁר stands in the place of a subordinate *nominative absolute*. See Art. 229. 13.

i. e. because that, &c. 2 Sam. xii. 10; עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע אַבְרָהָם בְּקֹלִי A CONSEQUENCE OF THAT WHICH (ejus quod) *Abraham hath heard my voice,* Gen. xxvi. 5.

So עַד אִם *until,* Ruth ii. 21; עַד אֲשֶׁר *until that which,* Jonah iv. 5; עַל אֲשֶׁר *upon that which, whereupon,* Deut. xxix. 24; עַל כִּי *Id.,* Jud. iii. 12; עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר *upon the affair which, because;* תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר Deut. xxi. 14; תַּחַת כִּי *beneath that which, because,* Prov. i. 29; לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר *for the purpose of which, because,* &c. Ezek. xx. 26. To these a great number of others may be added.

3d, The following passages are *apparently* elliptical, but *really* not so, when the nature of the particles are considered: חִזְּקוּ יְדֵי מְרֵעִים לְבִלְתִּי־שָׁבוּ *they have strengthened the hands of the evil doers, on account of their not having returned, &c.,* i. e. *because they have not returned from their evil ways,* Jer. xxiii. 14.

The word בִּלְתִּי *deficiency,* &c. is very nearly equivalent to לֹא *not,* the particle ל is added as before (Art. 251.): and the verb שָׁבוּ is manifestly in the preterite tense. The sense seems to be, that it is because none have returned from their evil ways, that the hands of sinners have been so much strengthened; and not, that none may return, which is the sense usually taken. So Isa. xiv. 6, מַכֵּה עַמִּים בְּעֶבְרָה מַכַּת בִּלְתִּי סָרָה *who strikes the people in wrath, a stroke* (that) *hath* NOT *departed.* Here מַכַּת and בִּלְתִּי are evidently in the definite state of construction, to which סָרָה is added as a verb; and, as it is contrary to the genius of every Oriental language to negative a noun, the force of this negative combination must necessarily fall upon the verb: thus, "a stroke without having passed away," i. e. continual. So we say in English, *in-finite, never-ending,* and the like, when we wish to express an indefinite continuity of any thing. In like manner: Deut. viii. 20, עֵקֶב לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּן BECAUSE (that) *you will* NOT *hear;* or, of your not hearing; taking לֹא as a noun signifying *deficiency, lack, want,* or the like, which it really is. See also Gen. xxii. 16, xxvii. 25, xxxviii. 11, Num. xi. 20, 1 Kings xxii. 42, Ps. cxix. 136. And more particularly with Infinitives or verbal nouns, Num. xiv. 16, Judg. vi. 18, Is. xlviii. 4; lx. 15, 2 Chron. xxviii. 6.

4th, It is not meant to be affirmed, however, that this sort of construction is always adhered to. The truth is, it is very much left to the writer, either to express himself thus, or to employ a greater number of words: and what is most remarkable, we sometimes find both methods adopted in the same context: e. g. עַד אֲשֶׁר־תָּשׁוּב חֲמַת

אָחִיךָ : עַד שׁוּב אַף־אָחִיךָ מִמְּךָ וְשָׁכַח &c. *until* THAT (time in) WHICH *the heat of thy brother shall turn away:* UNTIL THE TURNING AWAY *of thy brother's anger* AND (until) HE HAVE FORGOTTEN, &c. Gen. xxvii. 44—5; עַל שְׁלֹשָׁה .... עַל־מָאָסָם אֶת־תּוֹרַת יְהוָה (וְעַל־אֲשֶׁר) חֻקָּיו לֹא שָׁמָרוּ ON ACCOUNT OF *three* .... ON ACCOUNT *of their despising the law of Jehovah,* AND (on the account that) *they have not kept his statutes,* Amos ii. 4.—See also 1 Sam. iv. 19, 1 Kings xviii. 18, Is. x. 2, xxx. 12, xxxvii. 29, Jer. vii. 13. So the word טֶרֶם *not yet,* is found twice in Zeph. ii. 2. with לֹא, בְּטֶרֶם לֹא.

5th, It is the opinion of Schrœderus (R. 105.), that פֶּן *lest,* and אִם *if, surely,* &c. imply an ellipsis of some other word or words: as, פֶּן־תִּגְזֹל (*I will take care*) *lest thou take away,* &c. Gen. xxxi. 31. I can see no necessity for this. The real meaning of the word פֶּן seems to be, *seeing, observing,* or the like, from the root פנה; and if so, the passage may be rendered thus: *I feared, for I said,* SEEING THOU (*mightest*) TAKE AWAY, &c. So in the other passage cited, viz. 2 Kings ii. 16, פֶּן־נְשָׂאוֹ רוּחַ יְהוָה SEEING (that) *the Spirit of Jehovah* (might) HAVE TAKEN HIM UP. So also with respect to the particle אִם: 2 Sam. xi. 11, חַיֶּךָ וְחֵי נַפְשֶׁךָ אִם־אֶעֱשֶׂה אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה (as) *thy life and the life of thy soul* (is, so) SURELY *may I do this thing?* And again, Gen. xxiv. 37, 38, וַיַּשְׁבִּעֵנִי אֲדֹנִי לֵאמֹר לֹא־תִקַּח אִשָּׁה לִבְנִי מִבְּנוֹת הַכְּנַעֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי יֹשֵׁב בְּאַרְצוֹ : אִם־לֹא אֶל־בֵּית־אָבִי תֵּלֵךְ, &c. *and my Lord swore me, saying, Take not a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanite, in whose land I dwell:* SURELY *not. Go thou to my father's house,* &c. And at v. 41, אָז תִּנָּקֶה מֵאָלָתִי כִּי תָבוֹא אֶל־מִשְׁפַּחְתִּי וְאִם לֹא יִתְּנוּ לָךְ וְהָיִיתָ נָקִי מֵאָלָתִי *then shalt thou be free from my curse* (i. e.), *when thou shalt come to my kindred, and* (upon the condition that,—putting the matter on this issue) *they will* SURELY NOT *give to thee, then shalt thou be free from my curse.*

6th, If I am not greatly mistaken, there is no real ellipsis in any one of the passages in which this particle is found. This, however, must depend very much on the signification which we attach to it, and on the nature of the construction in which it is found; both of which we will now endeavour to explain.

7th, If we derive this particle from אמן *firm, steady, permanent,* and hence, *sure, surely, true, trust-worthy, faithful,* and the like; and, supposing it to be of the primitive form אִמְּן (see Art. 159.), which will make the elision of the ן necessary (Art. 82.), then we shall have אִם mean-

ing, *surely, truly, certainly,* &c. which appears to me to be its real force in every instance.

8th, We have seen (Art. 246, note), that, in hypothetical sentences, things are generally stated as facts, not as opinions. If then we propose the certainty of one fact, with some strong asseveration in one member of a sentence, and compare another with it, as being equally certain of occurrence in another, we shall do nothing more than what is always done in oaths and the like in Hebrew, when this word is employed in one of the members. In many cases such constructions may imply a negation, and hence this particle has been often so interpreted.* There is a passage, viz. Ruth iii. 12, which seems to confirm the etymology just given: וְעַתָּה כִּי אֱמֶת כִּי אִם גֹּאֵל אָנֹכִי *and now that* (it is) *true: for* TRULY, SURELY, *I am a Goel,* or *near kinsman.* This word has indeed been rejected by the Masorets in this place; but perhaps without any good reason for doing so. In this place, and perhaps in several others, the words אִם and אֱמֶת may be substituted the one for the other, and the sense will remain perfectly the same: e. g. Job xix. 5, וַאֲמִתּ־אֱמֶת שָׁגִיתִי אִתִּי תָּלִין מִשְׁגַּתִּי *and even* (let it be) TRUE, SURE, (that) *I have erred, with myself*

---

* This particle is very nearly allied in signification and usage to the Arabic إِنَّ or أَنَّ, which will occasionally involve a negation, and perhaps always an asseveration: but more nearly in derivation to أَمَّ, which is thought to be derived from a word, signifying *root, origin,* &c. In like manner حَقًّا or بِالْحَقِّ *surely, in* or *by the truth,* is used in the Arabic in swearing. See Gol. Lex. sub. voce. According to Mr. de Sacy, however, this particle is negative when the verb preceding it implies negation. Gram. Arab. vol. ii. Art. 667. In the examples following, however, in which he has treated it as a pleonasm, he seems to me entirely to have mistaken its force, especially as he himself has cited the Arabians in Art. 671. giving it the title of تَوْكِيد or *corroboration.* In every instance given by him, *certainly, surely, most certainly,* or the like, will supply the sense of the passage. See Art. 651—2. 668: i. e. putting the case either positively, or negatively, some consequence will, or will not, certainly come to pass, which is a kind of swearing.

lodges my error. So Is. iv. 4, 5, אִם רָחַץ אֲדֹנָי ... יְהוָה בָּרָא ... &c. ... TRULY *the Lord shall wash ... then shall he create,* &c. And in Job xix. 5, 6, we have both these particles occurring together, either for the purpose of strengthening the asseveration, or for qualifying both the prodosis and apodosis found in the context: e. g. אִם־אָמְנָם עָלַי תַּגְדִּילוּ וְתוֹכִיחוּ עָלַי חֶרְפָּתִי : דְּעוּ־אֵפוֹ כִּי־אֱלוֹהַּ עִוָּתָנִי &c. (as) SURELY (as) *ye* TRULY, or CONSTANTLY, *magnify yourselves,* or *speak great things against me,* and *chastise upon me my reproach;* (so surely) *know ye now, that God hath bent me* (down), &c.

9th, The following is an example which must be understood as involving a negation: חֵי פַּרְעֹה אִם־תֵּצְאוּ מִזֶּה כִּי אִם־בְּבוֹא אֲחִיכֶם &c. (as) *the life of Pharaoh* (exists), (so) TRULY *shall ye go forth hence, but* ESPECIALLY, TRULY, REALLY, *upon the coming in of your brother,* Gen. xlii. 15. That is, as certainly as the one thing exists, the other being made to appear equally so, no less certain shall your liberation be: but not before this condition is complied with. On this principle, I think, every instance in which this particle occurs can be resolved. That it is redundant, or that it has been omitted by the ellipsis, as affirmed by Noldius, p. 69, &c. I deny: because, I think, every passage adduced by him can be accounted for, without having recourse to those suppositions.

10th, From what has been said on the use and significations of some of these words, it will be easy to conceive, how they may be used either in their simple or compound state, for the purpose of connecting together such parts of a discourse, as the speaker or writer may wish should be considered in connection with one another: e. g. בָּרָא אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ *he created the heavens* AND *the earth,* Gen. i. 1. So, in the next verse: וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ AND (as to) *the earth, it was emptiness* AND *a vacuity,* &c. in which these particles are said to be *Copulative;* in others they are said to be *Disjunctive* (better, *Distinctive*), *Conditional, Causal,* or *Conclusive,* according to the signification of the passage in which they are found. The following are a few examples of each case.

Examples of Copulative Conjunctions.

טוֹב אֲשֶׁר־יָפֶה לֵאֱכוֹל וְלִשְׁתּוֹת *it is a good,* THAT *one becomingly eat and drink,* &c. Eccl. v. 17; וְהוּא אַדְמוֹנִי עִם־יְפֵה עֵינַיִם *and he was ruddy* WITH (being) *beautiful of eyes,* 1 Sam. xvi. 12; וַיִּתֵּנֵהוּ לְדָוִד וּמַדָּיו וְעַד חַרְבּוֹ &c. AND *he gave it to David,* EVEN *his garments* AND EVEN TO *his sword,* &c. Ib. xviii. 4.

See also Gen. vii. 23. In many cases there is an apparent excess in the use of the copulative conjunctions, which has been termed by the Grammarians πολυσύνθετον, see Gen. xxv. 34, xliii. 8, Jos. vii. 11, 2 Kings ii. 14, Ps. cvii. 37, &c. and in the New Testament, John x. 27, 28, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, 3, &c. perhaps to excite attention only.

11th, In other instances they are omitted, for the purpose of exhibiting the order of events, &c. the more closely or more rapidly in succession, as in the Latin, "*Veni, vidi, vici,*" &c. See Exod. xv. 9, Judg. v. 27, 1 Sam. xv. 6, &c. This has been termed ἀσύνθετον.

By the former of these *distribution* is sometimes intimated: as, וְאַיָּה וַעֲנָה *both Aiya and Ana,* Gen. xxxvi. 24; וֶרֶכֶב וָסוּס *both chariot and horse,* Ps. lxxvi. 7, &c. See Art. 229. 17. 18.

12th, Examples of *Disjunctive* (i. e. *Distinctive* or *Distributive*) *Conjunctions;* וְנָתַן אֵלֶיךָ אוֹת * אוֹ מוֹפֵת *and he shall give thee a sign* OR *a wonder,* Deut. xiii. 2; אוֹ הַנָּבִיא אוֹ־כֹהֵן EITHER *the prophet* OR *a priest,* Jer. xxiii. 33.

This particle, however, is often to be construed as being *conjunctive, adversative,* or, *conditional.* See Noldius sub voce, and Glass. Phil. Sacr. p. 524, &c., where similar usages are collected from the New Testament. It is also occasionally omitted by the ellipsis.

---

* Noldius derives this particle from אָוָה *velle,* i. e. (אַוָּה Art. 80. אַו and Art. 93. אוֹ) just as the Latin *vel* from *velle.* So in Persian we have خواه used in the same signification from خواستن to *desire, wish,* &c.

See 1 Sam. xx. 12, 2 Kings ix. 32, Is. xvii. 6, Ib. xxxviii. 14, Jer. xi. 19, &c. See Noldius, p. 4.

Examples of Conditional Conjunctions.

13th, אוּלַי יֵשׁ חֲמִשִּׁים צַדִּיקִים .... הֲתִסְפֶּה SHOULD *there be fifty righteous .... wilt thou also destroy,* &c., Gen. xviii. 24; אִם־תֵּלְכִי עִמִּי וְהָלָכְתִּי IF (or TRULY) *thou go with me, then I will surely go,* Jud. iv. 8.

14th, To these may be added אֲשֶׁר Lev. iv. 22; אֵת אֲשֶׁר 1 Kings viii. 24, &c. &c. Still it is not to be inferred, that these particles are always thus to be understood. See Judg. ix. 2, Job vi. 5, 6. 12, vii. 12, &c. See also Glass. Phil. Sacr. p. 519, &c.—Under this head may also be arranged the particles אִם and אִם־לֹא of asseveration and swearing, &c. See No. 5, &c. above.

Examples of Causal Conjunctions.

253. These are, for the most part, כִּי, כִּי אִם, עַל־כֵּן, לָכֵן, עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר, עֵקֶב, תַּחַת, תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר, לְמַעַן, לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר, יַעַן כִּי, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר, *for, whereupon, therefore, because, under* (the consideration that), &c.; כִּי לֹא אָבוֹא &c. *that I may not come,* &c., 1 Sam. xxix. 8; עַל־כֵּן אוֹחִיל *therefore I hope,* Lam. iii. 21; לְמַעַן שִׁמְךָ *because of thy name,* 1 Kings viii. 41, &c.

It would be endless, however, to give examples of every case, we must, therefore, refer the Reader to Noldius, and Glass. p. 533, &c., as before.

254. Of the *Conclusive* conjunctions it will not be necessary to say any thing. Those which are used as *Causals* in one place, may be considered as *Conclusive* in another; the position and the context being the only means by which the peculiar signification and bearing of these words can be ascertained.

Of the Interjections.

255. These are words, either *insignificant* in them-

selves: as, הוֹ הוֹ *oh oh!* הוֹי *O!* הֶאָח *ahah!* אוֹי *alas!* אֲהָהּ *alas!* or, *significant:* as, נָא* *up!* לְךָ, לְכָה, לְכוּ *go to!* הָבָה *give!* חָלִילָה *profane!* And, according to Schrœderus, אַשְׁרֵי *blessings!* Ps. i. 1, 1 Kings x. 8, Prov. xxix. 18, &c., which are usually pronounced in a manner expressive of *intreaty, aversion, pleasure, pain, excitation,* &c., according to the wish of the Speaker. Examples: יֹאמְרוּ הוֹ־הוֹ *they shall say,* OH! OH! Amos v. 16; הוֹי אָחִי *O my brother!* Jer. xxii. 18; הֶאָח נַפְשֵׁנוּ AHAH, *our desire!* Ps. xxxv. 25; אוֹי לְנַפְשָׁם ALAS, *for them!* Is. iii. 9; אֲהָהּ לַיּוֹם ALAS, *for the day!* Joel i. 15; לְךָ עֲשֵׂה GO TO, *do* (it), 2 Sam. vii. 3; הָבָה נֵרְדָה GIVE *(up),* GRANT (or the like), *let us descend,* Gen. xi. 7; סוּרוּ נָא *proceed ye,* MARK, OBSERVE! Num. xvi. 26; אִם יֶשְׁךָ־נָא מַצְלִיחַ דַּרְכִּי *if it be* (so with) *thee,* ATTEND, (as) *one prospering my journey,* Gen. xxiv. 42; חָלִילָה לֹא תָמוּת ABOMINABLE! FORBID IT! *thou shalt not die,* 1 Sam. xx. 2; חָלִילָה לִי מֵיְהוָה ABOMINABLE *to me! from* (or, *as forbidden by*) *Jehovah,* Ib. xxvi. 11.

See also 1 Kings xxi. 3, 2 Sam. xxiii. 17, 1 Chron. xi. 19. Glassius, Schrœderus, &c. however, supply תֶּחְשַׁב *imputabitur,* by the ellipsis in this place; see p. 550. Phil. Sacr. and Schrœd. Gram. Rule 106. Synt.

2. There are a few others, viz. אָנָּא or אָנָּה, the same perhaps with נָא; and בִּי† *attend,* ἴλεως, or the like, אִי *woe, alas;* סֶלָה *felix! O happy!* or the like. Examples:

---

* Imperat. a נָנָא *surrexit,* Schrœd. R. 106. So in Golius, in the third conj. but in the first, which I would rather take, "Intendit, proposuit sibi ... custodivit, servavit, &c." The meaning will then be, *look! observe! preserve!* Hence the phrase نوالك الله *may God preserve thee!* Ib.

† "Vox dolentis et supplicantis," says Noldius, which he derives from בָּוָה, as רִי is from רָוָה ... "notans consolationem, recreationem," as כְּמַר with

אָנָּא יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא אָנָּא יְהוָה הַצְלִיחָה נָּא *O Jehovah! save* NOW; *O Jehovah! give* NOW *prosperity,* Ps. cxviii. 25; אָנָּה יְהוָה זְכָר־נָּא *O Jehovah! remember* NOW, 2 Kings xx. 3; בִּי אֲדֹנִי יָרֹד יָרְדנוּ ATTEND, *my Lord, we truly came down,* &c., Gen. xliii. 20; אַי־לָךְ אֶרֶץ שֶׁמַּלְכֵּךְ נָעַר WOE *to thee, O land, whose king is a boy,* Eccl. x. 16; רַבִּים אֹמְרִים לְנַפְשִׁי אֵין יְשׁוּעָתָה לוֹ בֵּאלֹהִים סֶלָה *many say of my soul, there is no salvation for him in God.* PRAISE! Ps. iii. 3; אֶל־יְהוָה אֶקְרָא וַיַּעֲנֵנִי מֵהַר קָדְשׁוֹ סֶלָה * *to Jehovah do I cry, and he answers me from his holy hill.* PRAISE! Ib. v. 5; עַל עַמְּךָ בִרְכָתֶךָ סֶלָה *upon thy people* (is) *thy blessing.* PRAISE! † Ib. v. 9.

---

the Syrians, and بَارَكَ صَلَّى اللهُ "recreet et consoletur te Deus," among the Arabs. Concord. part. p. 175.

* Those who wish to see the various opinions entertained on the origin and meaning of this word may consult Noldius, Concord. Part. Anotationes et Vindiciæ, num. 1877. For my own part, I believe it to be descended from the root صَلَّى *he blessed,* &c., and used something like the word *amen,* or the *doxology* among ourselves.

† If the Psalms were originally sung or chanted in the Temple by two parties in a sort of dialogue, in which the one responded to the other, and both joined occasionally in a kind of chorus, as has been well supposed and maintained by Lowth and others, no word could, perhaps, be more proper than this for such occasional chorus: and hence perhaps the Διαψαλμα of the Seventy, and the לְעַלְמִין &c. *for ever,* of the Chaldee. See Nold. num. 1877., as above.

LECTURE XX.

ON THE COMPOSITION OF SENTENCES, &c., AS POINTED OUT BY THE INFLUENCE OF THE ACCENTS.

256. After what has been said on the composition of incomplex and simple propositions (Art. 226.), in addition to what has been stated and exemplified on the concordance and government of words, it cannot be necessary to exemplify our rules by adducing and accounting for complex and compound propositions, as they occur in this language. We shall, therefore, content ourselves by shewing, in what way this has been done by the authors of the accents.

On the Distinctive Powers of the Tonic Accents.

257. It has already been remarked (Art. 69.), that these accents are supposed to have the power of dividing sentences into their several members, just as it is the case with our comma, semicolon, colon, and period. Nothing, I think, can be more likely, than that the Masorets, or, whoever they were who affixed the vowel points to the Hebrew text, would apply some system to it, whereby the mutual dependence of its different parts upon one another would also be pointed out. It has been shewn, that these marks (Artt. 122—132.) also serve to mark the accented syllable in any word, as also that, which sustains a secondary kind of emphasis.

2d, But, at the same time, as these marks differ considerably from one another in shape and name, they may also have been invented for the purpose of pointing out the grammatical relations of words, or,

of sentences one to another, which I believe to be the case. The Jews, it is true, have attached certain musical notes to each of these marks, which may be seen in the Bibliotheca Rabbinica of Bartollocci (vol. iv. p. 427, &c.); or in the second volume of the Hebrew Grammar by Guarin (page 329, &c.):* but this is not to be wondered at. There has always existed a predilection for a sort of chanting in divine worship.—The Mahomedans chant their Koran, and we ourselves still continue to chant several parts of our ritual in the cathedrals and collegiate churches.

3d, If then we can suppose, that these accents were intended to divide the text of Scripture according to its grammatical construction, we shall very readily see how they would, when set to music, always produce a sort of harmony. Those, for example, which mark the greater pauses, would naturally suggest that a sort of cadence should be made by the Reader; and, the consequence has been, these accents have so been adapted to music as to produce such cadence. This, however, has been objected to by some; because, it has been said, the music so produced is not good. Perhaps so: still this need not surprise us, because it is very probable, that the accents were not originally intended for musical notes. Other difficulties, however, occur when we consider them as marking out the different members of a discourse like our comma, semicolon, colon, and period: for here, we cannot always say, why one form is preferred to another, and particularly when we find a double portion of them, as is the case in the decalogue. There is, nevertheless, so much probability, that they were originally intended to point out the connection of the different members of a period, one with another, and so much apparent uniformity in their general application in this respect, that we can for the most part ascertain, how these ancient Commentators understood the Sacred text.

4th, It is not our intention to detain the Learner long on this subject: we shall merely lay down the general principles as given by some of the best Writers, with a few examples by way of illustration, referring to these authors for further particulars.

5th, Nor should we have ventured on a subject sufficiently unpopular, and one which Schrœderus has entirely omitted, had it not

---

* Where we also have them in score, so that we can convert any part of the Hebrew Bible into a Quartett whenever we please!

frequently happened, that the Learner, in consulting some of the best Commentators, is met by statements relating to the accents which he must be unable to appreciate, without some previous knowledge as to the principles on which these statements may have been made. Besides, if these marks point out the relation subsisting between the several members of a period, they will also point out the parallelism: a subject of no small importance to the Scholar and Critic: and, if we may believe the statements of the best writers on the subject, they actually do point out the parallelism; which may serve to shew us, that this is not quite so modern a discovery as some have been willing to believe.* Let it be remembered, however, that it is not intended here to affirm, that these Accents are of divine authority; but only to recommend them, as affording a kind of commentary of considerable antiquity and value, and one with which every Scholar ought to be acquainted.

6th, In considering the nature and application of the accents, we have nothing to do with the *grammatical* or purely *formal* government of words (Art. 228. 5.). The *logical* import of passages is all we can be concerned with; and this may be considered in two points of view. The first is, that which respects the construction of phrases, as, of nouns in *immediate* or *mediate* apposition or construction, or, of verbs with their *apparent* nominatives, and the like: in all which the connection is considered and represented, as being the closest possible. The second is, the combination of such phrases, or sentences, in the construction of periods; and in this the connection will be considered and represented, as more or less close or dependent, according to the intention of the Writer.

7th, For the first of these cases, accents have been

---

* See also the Preface to Munster's Bible, ed. 1534, p. 15, line 36. "Est denique et hoc peculiare, &c.

adopted, which have been termed *Servants* or *Ministers*, and which are very rarely found in any other situation: for the second, two systems of accentuation are found to prevail in the Hebrew Bible: one peculiar to the Books which are generally termed Prosaic; the other to those which are said to be Poetical. The poetical Books are, Job אִיּוֹב, Proverbs מִשְׁלֵי, and the Psalms תְּהִלִּים; termed by the Rabbins אֱמֶ"ת, which is a technical word, formed out of the initials of the names above mentioned. All the rest of the Books are said to be Prosaic.

8th, We shall first lay down a few rules for the prosaic, and afterwards, for the poetical, books.

258. The following table exhibiting the relative powers, with the order of consecution, of the several accents, is taken from a Hebrew Grammar of considerable merit, which appeared for the third time, at Vienna, in 1810, by one *Jehuda Leb Ben Zeb*. This is adapted to the prosaic Books of the Bible only, and is sufficiently correct and extensive for our present purpose. Should the Student wish to pursue this subject to a greater length, he may consult the elaborate work of Ouseel, presently to be noticed, the Biblia Accentuata of Daschelius,* or the "Doctrina Accentuationis Hebrææ" by Daniel Weimar,† which last is certainly the best work I have seen on this subject; I have, therefore, generally followed it. See the Table of Accents (Art. 61.).

---

* Lipsiæ, 1729. † Lipsiæ, 1709.

A Table pointing out the Rank, Order, and Powers, of the different Accents.

	Distinctive.	Conjunctive.	Disjunctives.		
			Small.	Greater.	Greatest.
Emperors	סלוק:	מרכא	טפחא	זקף קטן	זקף קטן
	אתנח	מונח	*id.*	*id.*	*id.*
Kings	סגול	מונח	זרקא	רביעי	זקף קטן
	קפלין	*id.*	פשטא	*id.*	*id.*
	שפחא	מרכא	תביר	*id.*	*id.*
	רביעי	מונח	א.נ.ך	תלישא	ז.פ.ר
Dukes	זרקא	מונח	א.נ.ך	תלישא	ז.ר.פ
	פשטא	מהפך	*id.*	*id.*	*id.*
	תביר	דרגא	*id.*	*id.*	*id.*
	א.נ.ך	קדמא	תלישא	פזר	*id.*
Counts	פזר	מונח	מונח	פזר	ז.ר.פ
	תלישא ג	*id.*	*id.*	*id.*	*id.*

2d, The reader will find considerable difference between this table, and that given by Ouseel* in his elaborate work on the Hebrew accents. Ouseel's table is much larger, and contains several instances of the power and consecution of the accents not to be found here. *Shalshéleth,* שלשלת for example, with *Pĕsík,* is placed among the subdistinctives, which does not occur at all in our table. *Yerách* also is among the *conjunctives,* of which we have not a vestige here. *Zāképh gādól,* זקף

* "Tabula accentuationis," prefixed to his "Introductio in accentuationem Hebræorum prosaicam." Lugd. Batav. 1715.

גדול, and *Sĕgoltá* סגול or סגלתא, are also found among the *greatest distinctives* in consecution, to which several more, found in other places, may be added.

3d, I have not translated the terms employed by the Hebrew Grammarian, but have used those which appeared to me the most suitable.

4th, It will be perceived, that many of the words are abbreviated: as אֹ, for אַזְלָא, which is the same with *Géresh* (Art. 63.), the mark for which is placed above the א. In every other case, the form of the accent meant is placed over an initial letter of its name: as, תּ֫גּ *Telisha Gedóla*, תּ֫ק *Telisha Ketanna*, and so of others. In one instance we have זְ֫קְפִין, i. e. *Zakeph gadol* and *Zakeph katon*. The syllable *id.* is to shew that those above are to be repeated.

5th, It will not be necessary to explain the different names given to the several classes of accents in the tables above, as, Emperors, Kings, &c.; every one will see, that a greater or less dependence observed in the relation of phrases or sentences one to another, is intended to be pointed out by these titles.

6th, It should also be observed, that, in the above table, the accents greatest in rank, or, in other words, which point out those phrases, &c. which have the least dependence upon others, are placed uppermost: and, that those which accompany the closing word of any sentence, or member of a sentence, are placed at the left side. *Silluk* סלוק, for example, ranks highest, and is placed in the left hand column. Its office, therefore, is to close a period.

7th, In the next place, as these leading accents are situated at the close of a sentence, or of a member of a sentence, and are placed in the left-hand column of the table, we must look towards the right-hand for those which should either immediately, or more remotely, precede them. In this point of view, therefore, *Mercá* מרכא, will be found to attend on, or to precede, *Silluk*, as its servant.

8th, The second accent (proceeding downwards) in the left-hand column, is *Athnákh* אתנח. This accent, therefore, is the next inferior to *Silluk*; and is usually found to close a larger member of a sentence. To the right of *Athnákh* we find *Mūnákh* מונח, in the capacity of a *minister* or *servant*. *Athnákh*, therefore, is to be considered, as usually accompanied by *Mūnákh*.

9th, In the same manner, proceeding downwards, and again to the

right, we shall find the several accents with their attendants, which are supposed to mark the members of a sentence, each having a less dependence on one another than the preceding.

10th, We have now explained the use of the two first columns containing the distinctive, and their several accompanying accents. Let us now proceed to the other three, containing the small, greater, and greatest, distinctive accents.

11th, If we can suppose a period to consist of several sentences, or members of sentences, we can also suppose that each of these will have a greater or less dependence on one another, with respect to signification. The Author, from whom our table is taken, is of opinion (and with him all other writers on this subject agree), that phrases, considerably removed from the end of a verse or period, have less dependence on those which immediately follow them, than others have on those nearer its conclusion. Hence he has supposed, that the first of these, considered in the capacity of *distinctive*, will have a greater dependence on those which immediately follow them, than others will, which are farther removed from the end of the period, &c. Hence, these have been termed small, the next greater, and the next or last, the greatest, distinctives. Now, most of these, considered as *distinctives*, will be found in the left hand column, their servants or attendants will be always found there also, in the next, or right-hand column, as already explained.

12th, Hence it should seem, that, for the most part, every second accent, counting from the end of a period or sentence, and proceeding backwards towards its beginning, will be a *distinctive* one: and that, immediately to its right, will be found its *attendant* or *servant*. And, the truth is, this is found to be the case. In the above table, therefore, we shall have the order of the accents for a very great variety of cases. That they are not all found to occur, must be certain, from the consideration, that there are several accents in use not to be found in this table at all. But, as our limits will not allow us to enter fully into this subject, we have deemed our table sufficient for the present. Let us now proceed to our rules and illustrations.

259. Words in apposition or construction, either *immediate* or *mediate*, will be connected by a conjunctive accent: as, יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים *the Lord God*, Gen. iii. 1; עֶבֶד אַבְרָהָם *Abraham's servant*, Gen. xxiv. 33; אַחַת מֵאֶלֶף *one of a thousand*, Job ix. 3. So אֱלֹהֵי מִקָּרֹב *the God of him who is near*, &c. Jer. xxiii. 23; עֶבֶד

וְשִׁפְחָה *servant and maiden,* Gen. xxxii. 6; בַּדֶּרֶךְ בָּרֶךְ *in way,* (and) *in way,* i. e. in the common roads, Deut. ii. 27 .... חֶרֶב חֶרֶב *a sword* (nay) *a sword* .... Ezek. xxi. 14; מְאֹד מְאֹד *exceedingly, exceedingly,* Numb. xiv. 7; בְּיָד חֲזָקָה *with a mighty hand,* Exod. iii. 19.

2d, The same is the case when the construction is *distinctive* (Art. 237.): as, נְקִי כַפַּיִם *clean* (of) *hands,* Ps. xxiv. 4; בַּר־לֵבָב *pure* (of) *heart,* Ib.*

3d, The same holds good when one of the words so connected occupies the place of an adverb, or *specificative* (p. 301. note): פַּחַד פִּתְאֹם *sudden fear,* Prov. iii. 24; שְׁאוֹל מָטָּה *the grave beneath,* Ib. xv. 24.

4th, The numerals are similarly connected with the thing numbered, as are also particles with the words with which they are to be construed. To which also may be added verbs, when repeated for the purpose of giving greater emphasis, or when succeeding one another, in order to vary the sense; or, as found with, or without, the connecting particles.

5th, The verb is generally connected with its *apparent* nominative (Art. 229.), by means of a conjunctive accent: as, בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים *God created,* Gen. i. 1; וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם *and Abram said,* Ib. xv. 2.

6th, The word complementary of the signification of a verb (Art. 240, &c.), or its objective case, is frequently connected with it in the same way: as, עָשׂוּ מִלְחָמָה *they made war,* Gen. xiv. 2.

7th, Also when a particle intervenes: as, הוֹלֵךְ עִמָּם *walking with them,* Gen. xviii. 16. There are several exceptions, however, to this rule.

8th, When more than than two words, immediately following each other, stand in the same apparent relation to one another, those, which are more immediately connected together in signification, will have a conjunctive accent, the others disjunctive ones, according to the relation in which they are found with the others: as, זָהָב וְכֶסֶף וּנְחֹשֶׁת *gold and silver, and brass,* Exod. xxv. 3. So, חֹשֶׁן וְאֵפוֹד וּמְעִיל *a breast-plate, an ephod, and a robe,* Ib. xxviii. 4.

---

* *Makkáph* is to be considered as a conjunctive accent here and elsewhere. The *distinctive* accent here is a compound (see p. 28.), not found in our table.

9th, This holds good in members of sentences, verbs, &c. having similar relations to each other: as, וְאֶת־כָּל־בְּהֶמְתָּם וְאֶת־כָּל־מִקְנֵיהֶם וְאֶת־כָּל חֵילָם בָּזָזוּ *and all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their power, they spoiled,* Num. xxxi. 9; לֹא־אֶחְמֹל וְלֹא־אָחוּס וְלֹא אֲרַחֵם *I will neither suffer, nor spare, nor have mercy,* Jer. xiii. 14.

10th, And also when they are not all of the same person: as, אֲדַבְּרָה וְאָעִידָה בּוֹ וְיִשְׁמָעוּ *I will speak, and will attest, and they shall hear,* Jer. vi. 10.

11th, Numerals are similarly connected: as, שֶׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים וּמָאתַיִם *seven and twenty and two hundred.*—See Gen. v. xi. &c.

12th, In all these cases, the two first words, or sentences, so occurring, are connected in accordance with the rule. In the following, the two last are, for the same reason: as, דָּגָן תִּירוֹשׁ וְיִצְהָר *corn, wine, and oil,* Deut. xxviii. 51; צֹאן וְעֶבֶד וְשִׁפְחָה *flocks, and menservants and maidservants,* Gen. xxxii. 6.

13th, The same will hold good in any number of words, subject to a similar regimen: as, בְּכֶסֶף וּבְזָהָב וּבְנְחֹשֶׁת וּבְבַרְזֶל וּבְשַׂלְמוֹת *with silver and with gold, and with brass and with iron, and with garments,* Josh. xxii. 8.

14th, When several nouns succeed one another, each in construction with the following one, the leading words in the sentence will sometimes have disjunctive accents; the former being always greater than that next in succession; or, they will be divided into pairs, according to the pleasure of the Writer, or, as the sense of the passage shall require: פְּקֻדַּת שִׁמְרֵי מִשְׁמֶרֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ *the superintendance of the keepers of the charge of the sanctuary,* Numb. iii. 32; אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב *the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,* Exod. iii. 16.

15th, Nouns, or phrases, to be construed as *nominatives absolute,* will be distinguished from the following context by a *disjunctive* accent:* as, וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ *and* (as to) *the earth, it was void and emptiness,* Gen. i. 2; וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם *and* (as to)

---

* Hence Jarchi's comment on Ezek. i. 11, which has so frequently been cited and misunderstood, is only intended to shew, that וּפְנֵיהֶם with *Zaképh gadol* is to be separated from the word following, thus: וּפְנֵיהֶם וְכַנְפֵיהֶם פְּרֻדוֹת מִלְמָעְלָה *and* (as to) *their faces, even their wings were spread out above* (them). His words are: חיו פרודות למעלה מפניהם ומכסות אותם.

the Spirit of God (it was) *brooding upon the face of the waters,* Ib.; דִּמְוּת פְּנֵיהֶם פְּנֵי אָדָם *and* (as to) *the likeness of their faces* (it was as) *the faces of men,* Ezek. i. 10.

16th, And, in the same manner, all nouns or phrases added for the purpose of qualifying, defining, or otherwise limiting others, but not so closely connected as to form phrases, &c. with them, will be marked by one or other of the disjunctive accents: as, הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים: *I brought thee forth from the land of Egypt—from the house of servants,* Exod. xx. 2.

The same holds good in all parenthetical passages: as, וַיֵּצֵא מֶלֶךְ־סְדֹם לִקְרָאתוֹ (אַחֲרֵי שׁוּבוֹ מֵהַכּוֹת אֶת־כְּדָרְלָעֹמֶר וְאֶת־הַמְּלָכִים אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ) אֶל־עֵמֶק שָׁוֵה *and the king of Sodom went out to meet him (after his return from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer, and of the kings who were with him) at the valley of Shaveh,* Gen. xiv. 17. And again: רַק נְשֵׁיכֶם וְטַפְּכֶם וּמִקְנֵכֶם (יָדַעְתִּי כִּי־מִקְנֶה רַב לָכֶם) יֵשְׁבוּ בְּעָרֵיכֶם *only your wives, and your little ones, and your cattle (for I know that ye have much cattle), shall abide in your cities,* Deut. iii. 19. Again: וַיְדַבְּרוּ אֵלָיו הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ לֵאמֹר כֹּה־תֹאמַר לָעָם הַזֶּה (אֲשֶׁר דִּבְּרוּ אֵלֶיךָ לֵאמֹר אָבִיךָ הִכְבִּיד אֶת־עֻלֵּנוּ וְאַתָּה הָקֶל מֵעָלֵינוּ) כֹּה תְדַבֵּר אֲלֵיהֶם קָטְנִי עָבָה מִמָּתְנֵי אָבִי: *and the young men who had grown up with him, spake unto him, saying, Thus shalt thou speak unto this people (who have spoken unto thee, saying, Thy father made our yoke heavy, but make thou it lighter unto us), thus shalt thou say unto them, My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins,* 1 Kings xii. 10. Again: וַיִּתֵּן אֶל־מֹשֶׁה (כְּכַלֹּתוֹ לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ בְּהַר סִינָי) שְׁנֵי לֻחוֹת הָעֵדֻת *and he gave unto Moses (when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai), two tables of testimony,* Exod. xxxi. 18.

260. When a verse consists of more propositions than one, or, of several members of a sentence, the greater *distinctive accent* will generally be found placed at the end of that proposition, or member, which is most complete in its signification: or, if the context is sententious, at that part which marks the parallelism of the whole period. Example: וְיָצָא חֹטֶר מִגֵּזַע יִשָׁי וְנֵצֶר מִשָּׁרָשָׁיו יִפְרֶה: *and there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse: and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit,* Is. xi. 1.

2d, Here, if we take the liberty of separating the context, according to the importance of the accents, we may write it out thus:

וְנָצָא חֹטֶר מִגֵּזַע יִשָׁי וְנֵצֶר מִשָּׁרָשָׁיו יִפְרֶח׃

3d, The following example from Gen. i. 2, contains several propositions.

וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ
וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם
וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת
עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם׃

And (as to) *the earth* (it was) *emptiness and a void:*
And darkness (was) *upon the face of the great deep:*
And (as to) *the Spirit of God*, (it was) *brooding*
Upon the face of the waters.

The phrases וְהָאָרֶץ and וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, I take to be *nominatives absolute*, and therefore, as being properly divided by distinctive accents from the context following (Art. 259. 15.). It should also be observed, we have three distinct propositions in this verse: the first ending with וָבֹהוּ, having the distinctive accent *Rĕviăh;* the second with תְּהוֹם, having *Athnákh;* and the third with *Silluk* and (׃) *Soph Pāsúk*. Here also, as before, the accents distinctly mark the parallelism of the different members of the verse.

4th, In the following passage, we have four distinct propositions, viz. Isa. i. 2.

שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמַיִם וְהַאֲזִינִי אֶרֶץ
כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר
בָּנִים גִּדַּלְתִּי וְרוֹמַמְתִּי
וְהֵם פָּשְׁעוּ בִי׃

Hear ye heavens, and give ear, O earth,
For Jehovah, he hath spoken,
(As to) *children, I have brought up, and exalted* (them);
But they,—they have rebelled against me.

5th, Here the termination of every member marks the close of a distinct proposition, each of which is distinguished by a larger accent, which also serves to point out the parallelism, as before. So in the following: Isa. xlix. 4;

וַאֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי לְרִיק יָגַעְתִּי
לְתֹהוּ וְהֶבֶל כֹּחִי כִלִּיתִי

But I—I had said, I have laboured in vain:
For emptiness and vanity, I have consumed my strength.

On the Accentuation of the Metrical Books אמ״ת, *i. e. Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms.*

261. The accentuation which we now proceed to consider, commences at the third verse of the third chapter of the book of Job, and continues to the fifth of the forty-second, whence the prosaic accentuation is continued to the end. The whole book of Psalms, with that of Proverbs, is also subject to this metrical accentuation: the remaining books of the Bible are not.

2d, The system of the accents, generally, it should be observed, is the same both in the prosaic and metrical books: that is, one set of accents serve as *disjunctives*, the other as *conjunctives*, in both either dividing or connecting the several parts of the context, according to the interpretation of the authors of these marks. The only difference observable in its application is, that the powers peculiar to some of the accents differs, in some respects, from that just mentioned, as does also their order of consecution.

3d, The *distinctive* accents, according to this system, are, ׃ *Sillúk*, ֽ *Mercá* with *Mahpák*, ֒ *Athnákh*, ֑ *Rĕvíăḥ* with *Géresh*, ֑ *Rĕvíăḥ*, ֪ *Zarká*, ֔ *Tiphkhá* anterior, ֡ *Pāzér*, ׀ *Shalshéleth* with *Pĕsík*, ׀ *Kadmá* with *Pĕsík*, and ׀ *Mahpák* with *Pĕsík*.

4th, The *conjunctive* or *servile* accents are the following: ֥ *Mercá*, ֪ *Mercá* with *Zarká*, ֖ *Mahpák*, ֪ *Mahpák* with *Zarká*, ֣ *Mūnákh*, ֣ *Mūnákh* superior, ֔ *Tiphkhá*, not anterior, and ֤ *Yérakh*.

5th, The *distinctives* are here given according to their order of precedence: the *conjunctives* are considered as having no such order, as before. The distinctives on which these usually attend, may be found in the tables of Ouseel and others.

6th, It will be seen from the forms and titles above given, that several of these accents are mere combinations of two of those already given (See Art. 62.).

7th, The accents accompanying *Soph-pāsúk* and *Pĕsík* are always found on the tone-syllable.

8th, Of *Mercá* with *Mahpák* ֥, *Mercá* is always under the tone-syllable; *Mahpák* is placed on the preceding syllable, if there be any; if not, it remains on the same syllable. If, however, the preceding word be connected by *Makkáph*, or end in a furtive *Pathakh*, *Mahpák* may then be on its last syllable.

9th, The same holds good with respect to ֥֒ *Mercá* with *Zarká*, and ֥֒ *Mahpák* with *Zarká*.

10th, In the occurrence of ֑ *Rĕvĭăḥ* with *Géresh*, *Rĕvĭăḥ* is always on the tone-syllable, and *Géresh* carried as nearly to the beginning of the word as possible. But when no other syllable remains, they are placed together, שְׁמֹו֑ *his name*; and נֹ֖דּוּ *flee ye*.

262. It will easily be conceived, that if the *disjunctives* here, as before, have been invested with various powers for the purpose of dividing and subdividing any given part of the Biblical context into its several members, and thereby to facilitate the discovery of its meaning, the order of consecution of these disjunctives may be exceedingly numerous, just as the different modes of construction would require. With the view of familiarizing the Student with the different powers of these accents, therefore, tables have been formed, first giving the order of consecution found among these dis-

junctives; and, lastly, of these with their several attendants. When speaking of the prose accents, we laid down such a table, rather with the view of complying with custom than any thing else. At present we shall content ourselves with a few examples only, and leave it to the industry of the Student to construct such tables for himself, should he think it necessary: believing it to be quite sufficient to make him acquainted with the principles, which it is trusted the following examples, in addition to what has been said, will be sufficient to do.

2d, The following is an abstract of the analysis given by Ouseel of the first verse of the first Psalm.*

אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר׀ לֹא הָלַךְ֒ בַּעֲצַת רְשָׁעִים וּבְדֶרֶךְ חַטָּאִים לֹא עָמָד וּבְמוֹשַׁב לֵצִים לֹא יָשָׁב׃

3d, This is to be divided, in the first place, into the two larger divisions indicated by the greater distinctive accents, which are ֗ *Sillúk*, and ֜ *Mercá* with *Mahpák* (Art. 261. 3.). We shall have, therefore, for the first great division:

אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר׀ לֹא הָלַךְ֒ בַּעֲצַת רְשָׁעִים *The blessings of the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the wicked.*

4th, In the next place, the division to be taken, according to the importance of the accents, will be, first, אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ *the blessings of the man.* Or, considering these two words as constituting a nominative absolute, (as to) *the blessings of the man*, which is universally accompanied by a larger distinctive accent (Art. 259. 15.). In the next place, the two words, viz. אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ, will, on account of their close connection, be connected by a conjunctive accent; and here we have ֫ *Mūnákh* for that purpose (Art. 261. 4.).

5th, The next portion we must take will be אֲשֶׁר׀ לֹא הָלַךְ֒ *who hath not walked.* Here we have first אֲשֶׁר׀ with *Mahpák* and *Pĕsík*, which is the least *disjunctive* in our table. And, according to our consecution in prose (Art. 259. 14.), when the two last of the consecutive

---

* Accentuatio Metrica, c. xvii. § 18—19, &c.

words are more immediately connected with one another, than either is with the preceding, the former will have a smaller disjunctive accent.

6th, In the next place, לֹא חָלַךְ must be construed together (Art. 259. 3.), they are, therefore, connected by a conjunctive accent.

7th, The next two words are, בַּעֲצַת רְשָׁעִים *in the counsel of the wicked,* which, from their logical character, must be construed together. They are therefore connected by the conjunctive accent *Yérakh.* This concludes the first division, or parallel of our sentence.

8th, Let us now proceed to the second.

וּבְדֶרֶךְ חַטָּאִים לֹא עָמָד וּבְמוֹשַׁב לֵצִים לֹא יָשָׁב׃ *and in the way of sinners hath not stood; and in the habitation of sinners hath not resided.*

9th, The first larger division of this part of the verse will end at עָמָד, where we have the next larger *distinctive* accent. This may again be subdivided into two smaller ones, the former of which will end at חַטָּאִים, having the distinctive accent ֒ *Tiphkhá* anterior.

10th, In this smaller division, viz. וּבְדֶרֶךְ חַטָּאִים, we have two words in construction; and this is marked by the conjunctive accent ֫ *Mūnákh.*

11th, The next phrase, לֹא עָמָד is connected in the same way, and for the same reason.

12th, Our next subdivision will be וּבְמוֹשַׁב לֵצִים. Here we have *Rĕvĭăḥ* with *Géresh* for a *distinctive,* and *Mercá* for its preceding *conjunctive* accent.

13th, In the last place, ׃ לֹא יָשָׁב will be connected by the conjunctive accent ֫ *Mūnákh;* and *Sillúk* with *Soph-pasúk* will close the period.

14th, We do not think it will be necessary to pursue this subject any further: enough has been said to point out the use of the accents, and this is all we proposed to do. With regard to the formulæ usually given, shewing the consecution of the accents, it may be remarked, that, generally speaking, they are sufficient to point out the way in which this subject is taught; but, when we come to particulars, are very inadequate. Even in the few examples we have given, our tables fail: and, the truth seems to be, that, as the forms of composition may be indefinite, so may those of the consecution of the accents.

FINIS.

Macintosh, Printer,
20, Great New Street, London.